

Forty-Second Annual  
REPORT

*of the*

Hawaiian Historical  
Society

FOR THE YEAR 1933



Honolulu, Hawaii  
Published May, 1934

HAWN  
DU620  
H4  
1933  
Closed  
Shelves  
C-3



UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII  
LIBRARY

Forty-Second Annual  
REPORT

*of the*

Hawaiian Historical  
Society

FOR THE YEAR 1933



Honolulu, Hawaii  
Published May, 1934

*The Hawaiian Historical Society is not responsible for the views  
expressed by writers who contribute to its proceedings.*

*Contents of this Report  
May be Reprinted in  
Whole or Part if Credit  
is Given to Author and  
Society.*

Printed by  
Paradise of the Pacific



## CONTENTS

|  | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Officers and Committees for 1934.....                                | 4    |
| Minutes of Meetings.....   | 5    |
| Report of the President.....   | 7    |
| Report of the Treasurer.....   | 9    |
| Report of the Librarian.....   | 10   |
| How the Territory of Hawaii Grew<br>and What Domain it Covers.....   | 13   |
| P. C. MORRIS   |      |
| Honolulu and Some New Speculative Phases<br>of Hawaiian History..... | 40   |
| J. F. G. STOKES  |      |
| The Ship <i>Eliza</i> at Hawaii in 1799.....                         | 103  |
| JUDGE F. W. HOWAY  |      |
| List of Members.....   | 114  |

## OFFICERS FOR 1934

|  |                        |
|--|------------------------|
| President.....                               | REV. HENRY P. JUDD     |
| Vice-President.....                          | HON. W. F. FREAR       |
| Secretary (Recording and Corresponding)..... | R. S. KUYKENDALL       |
| Treasurer.....                               | THOMAS W. ELLIS        |
| Librarian.....                               | MISS CAROLINE P. GREEN |
| Trustee until 1935.....                      | THOMAS W. ELLIS        |
| Trustee until 1935.....                      | HON. W. F. FREAR       |
| Trustee until 1935.....                      | SAMUEL WILDER KING     |
| Trustee until 1936.....                      | VICTOR S. K. HOUSTON   |
| Trustee until 1936.....                      | RALPH S. KUYKENDALL    |
| Trustee until 1936.....                      | JAMES TICE PHILLIPS    |

---

TRUSTEE, LIBRARY OF HAWAII  
BRUCE CARTWRIGHT

---

## COMMITTEES

*Finance Committee*

Thomas W. Ellis, Chairman

J. T. Phillips

W. F. Frear

*House Committee*

Miss Margaret Newman, Chairman

Miss Caroline P. Green

Miss Margaret Titcomb

*Editorial and Printing Committee*

Ralph S. Kuykendall, Chairman

V. S. K. Houston

J. F. G. Stokes

*Purchasing Committee*

J. Tice Phillips, Chairman

T. W. Ellis

Miss Caroline P. Green

*Membership Committee*

Clifton H. Tracy, Chairman

Edwin H. Bryan, Jr.

Miss Bernice Judd

*Program and Research Committee*

Rev. H. P. Judd, Chairman

V. S. K. Houston

P. C. Morris

*Nominating Committee*

Frank E. Midkiff, Chairman

Gregg Sinclair

A. Lewis, Jr.



MINUTES OF A PUBLIC MEETING  
DECEMBER 14, 1933

---

A public meeting of the Hawaiian Historical Society was held on this date at the Library of Hawaii, opening at 7:45 p. m. with President Henry P. Judd in the chair.

Mr. Judd made some appropriate remarks upon the subject of the recent death of Bishop Restarick, and the following resolutions, prepared by Mr. W. W. Thayer, were adopted by a unanimous vote.

"WHEREAS, Rt. Rev. Henry Bond Restarick, President Emeritus of the Hawaiian Historical Society, died in Honolulu on the 8th day of December, 1933,

"BE IT RESOLVED by the members of the Hawaiian Historical Society, assembled in meeting, December 14, that we here record our deep appreciation for the long and diligent service which he rendered to this Society and our profound regret at the loss which we and this entire community have sustained in his death. Bishop Restarick had been a member of the Society for more than twenty-five years and from 1905 until 1925 was a Vice-President, and from 1926 until 1933 was its President. At the annual meeting in 1933 he was unanimously elected as President Emeritus. During all this period he took a vital interest in the work of the Society. He was a profound student of the early history of Hawaii and had gone more carefully into the moot question of the identity of the first European to visit these Islands than any other person. He contributed to the publications of this Society a number of very interesting articles on subjects relating to Hawaii's early history. As an officer of the Society he was constant in his attendance and at all times maintained a direct interest in our progress. His loss will be one the Society will greatly feel.

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting and that a copy thereof be sent to Bishop Restarick's family."

Mr. R. S. Kuykendall made some remarks upon the neglected and dilapidated condition of the grave of William Richards at Lahaina, Maui, and referred briefly to the services rendered by Mr. Richards as missionary and as an officer, in various capacities, of the Hawaiian government; he suggested that it would be appropriate and within the expressed objects of this Society to re-

store the grave; he therefore moved that the subject be referred to the Trustees of the Society with instructions to take such steps as may be necessary to restore the grave of Mr. Richards to a proper condition and to see that it is maintained in such a condition. The motion was duly seconded and was adopted by a unanimous vote.

The Society and the visitors present were then favored with the presentation of comprehensive abstracts of two interesting and valuable papers, the result of extended research by two of our fellow members. The papers are the following:

"How the Territory of Hawaii Grew and What Domain It Covers," by Mr. Penrose C. Morris.

"Honolulu: Some Aspects of Its Early History," by Mr. John F. G. Stokes.

The meeting, one of the most largely attended in the recent history of the Society, was adjourned at 9:30 p. m.

R. S. KUYKENDALL,  
Secretary.

## MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL MEETING FEBRUARY 23, 1934

The annual meeting of the Hawaiian Historical Society was held on the above date in the auditorium of the Library of Hawaii. The meeting opened at 7:45 p. m. with President Henry P. Judd in the chair.

The minutes of the meeting of December 14, 1933, were read and approved.

The reports of the President, Treasurer and Librarian were read, accepted, and placed on file for the annual report of the Society.

The next order of business was the election of a President (to serve for one year) and three Trustees (to serve for two years).



The Nominating Committee presented the following nominations:

For President, Rev. Henry P. Judd

For Trustees until 1936:

Victor S. K. Houston

Ralph S. Kuykendall

James Tice Phillips

There being no further nominations, it was moved, seconded, and carried that the Secretary cast the ballot for the persons named. This was done and the above named gentlemen were declared elected.

The following program was then rendered:

A paper prepared by Judge F. W. Howay on the subject "The Ship Eliza at Hawaii in 1799" was presented by the Secretary.

Mr. J. F. G. Stokes gave a talk containing the substance of a paper written by him for the Fifth Pacific Science Congress on the subject "Japanese in Pre-historic Hawaii."

Dr. E. S. C. Handy of the Bishop Museum read a paper dealing with "The Possible Historical Significance of the Kumulipo Creation Story."

The meeting was then adjourned, at 9:30 p. m.

R. S. KUYKENDALL,  
Secretary.

---

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE  
HAWAIIAN HISTORICAL SOCIETY—HENRY P. JUDD,  
SUBMITTED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING,  
FEBRUARY 23, 1934 ..

---

To one who has served for the first time as president of the Society, it seems as though the year has been a rather quiet one, devoid of any special features or undue excitement. The only exception was the prize essay contest sponsored by the Society early last year. More than one hundred essays were submitted in

the competition on the subject of "The Life and Work of Kamehameha." These essays were submitted by students in the Junior High Schools throughout the territory. I feel that the object of this competition was accomplished most successfully, that is, that we have succeeded in arousing considerable interest among the young people of our schools in the study of Hawaiian history. Reports from librarians indicate that a great many calls were made for information regarding Hawaiian history in connection with this essay competition.

It is to be hoped that from time to time similar efforts will be put forth by the Society to keep up an interest in Hawaiian history on the part of our young people in the public schools.

The collection of Hawaiiana in our Society Rooms is apparently being more and more appreciated by the general public, but it is evident that there are still many people in our own city who are not aware of the rich treasures we possess in this department of human activity. It will take considerable time and personal effort on the part of the present members of the Society to secure the interest of others in the use of our facilities.

During the past year four new members have been enrolled; but as we are constantly losing each year members from death and other causes, it is about time for us to launch a campaign, the object of which is to increase our membership. We realize that in time of depression it is hard for some people to take on any thing new in the way of expense, but perhaps a carefully conceived plan may result in a substantial gain in our enrollment.

There is a keen interest evinced by a small group in our Society; may this interest be extended to a large majority of the membership whose faces are never seen in the Society Rooms. We are grateful for their assistance in what we are endeavoring to do, but we would appreciate their own personal calls at the Society Rooms.

Respectfully submitted,

HENRY P. JUDD.

President.



# TREASURER'S REPORT February 24, 1933, to February 20, 1934.

## INCOME

|   |           |           |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| Balance in Commercial Account<br>as of February 24, 1933..... | \$ 546.41 |           |
| Initiation Fees .....   | 4.00      |           |
| Dues .....  | 323.00    |           |
| Dues Kauai Historical Society.....                            | 67.00     |           |
| Sale of Reports and Publications.....                         | 11.50     | \$ 951.91 |

## DISBURSEMENTS

|   |           |        |
|---|-----------|--------|
| Printshop<br>(400 Copies 41st Annual Report).....   | \$ 305.35 |        |
| Mellen Associates<br>(Meeting notices, mailing reports and changes<br>in mailing list)..... | 13.66     |        |
| Dues Business Historical Society.....   | 10.00     |        |
| Dues California Historical Society.....   | 10.00     |        |
| Purchase of books and engraving.....  | 45.48     |        |
| Pamphlet boxes.....   | 12.70     |        |
| Bishop Trust Co. (Safe Deposit Box).....  | 4.40      |        |
| Repairs Iron Gate and New Glass.....  | 5.65      |        |
| Postage Stamps.....   | 6.00      |        |
| Prizes: Kamehameha Essay Contest.....   | 90.00     |        |
| Use of Auditorium (Library of Hawaii).....  | 2.50      |        |
| Tax on checks.....  | .74       | 506.48 |

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| Balance in Commercial Account as of<br>February 20, 1934..... | \$ 445.43 |
|---|-----------|

## ENDOWMENT FUND

|   |           |        |
|---|-----------|--------|
| Balance in Savings Account February 24, 1933..... | \$ 683.83 |        |
| Interest on Savings Account.....                  | 26.07     |        |
| Interest on Bonds.....                            | 170.00    |        |
| Dividends on von Hamm-Young Stock.....            | 59.77     | 939.67 |

## ASSETS

|   |             |            |
|---|-------------|------------|
| Two \$1,000 Theo. H. Davies Bonds, Par Value..... | \$ 2,000.00 |            |
| One \$1,000 Olaa Sugar Co. Bond, Par Value.....   | 1,000.00    |            |
| Ten Shares von Hamm-Young Preferred Stock.....    | 995.00      |            |
| Cash-Commercial Account .....                     | 445.43      |            |
| Cash-Savings Account .....                        | 939.67      | \$5,380.10 |

Respectfully submitted,

THOMAS W. ELLIS,  
Treasurer.

Feb. 21, 1934.

Audited and found correct:  
D. W. ANDERSON.

REPORT OF THE LIBRARIAN  
1933

---

To the Officers and Members of  
the Hawaiian Historical Society,  
Ladies and Gentlemen:

Unavoidable changes in the schedule of the Library of Hawaii, have so reduced time allotted to the Historical Society, that this report is necessarily brief. However, I have tried to keep the library in order, attended to the correspondence, and aided in research.

The promised set of the Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society, an exchange mentioned in my last report, came safely to hand. It is to be hoped that sometime the society can afford to have the volumes bound.

It was a pleasure to add to our collection of Hawaiiiana, the following titles of recent publication:

"Shakespeare and Hawaii," talks given by Christopher Morley, at the University of Hawaii last month.

"Flora Hawaiiensis; or, New Illustrated Flora of the Hawaiian Islands," by Otto Degener.

"Hawaii and Its People," a comprehensive geography, by Lorna H. Jarrett.

"Hawaiian Nature Notes," by Edwin H. Bryan, Jr.; a reprint of fifty articles in the Honolulu Advertiser, to which the author has added very helpful bibliographies.

"Stories of Hawaii: Its History and Chief Industries," a delightful tale for children, by Mrs. Ann S. French.

"Ancient Hawaiian Civilization," a series of lectures delivered at the Kamehameha Schools in 1933.

"Paradox in Hawaii: An Examination of Industry and Education," by David L. Crawford, President of the University of Hawaii.



We were fortunate in the opportunity of purchasing two books written by William Wyatt Gill, for sixteen years resident of the South Pacific islands and a keen observer of the life and customs of the people: "Selections from His Autobiography," published in 1880; and "From Darkness to Daylight in Polynesia, with Illustrative Clan Songs," published in 1894.

The last thing that Bishop Restarick ever did for the library was to forward me a letter from the Arthur H. Clark Co., offering for sale a copy of Mrs. Beatrice A. Patton's book of Hawaiian legends, written in the French language, illustrated by Miss May Fraser, and published in Paris in 1932. I wrote at once and secured it. So this exquisite volume, of which only 200 copies were printed, is now on our shelves.

We are indebted to Mr. George Sherman for his gift of a beautifully bound copy of "Voyage Pittoresque Autour du Monde," illustrated by the Russian artist, Louis Choris, Paris, 1822; and to Mr. Henry H. Hart of San Francisco, for "A Chinese Market, Lyrics from the Chinese in English Verse," translated by the donor, who has long been a member of this society.

Mr. John A. Ferguson of Sydney, kindly sent a pamphlet published by the Royal Australian Historical Society, entitled "Voyage of Torres." It is a review and criticism of the book "New Light on the Discovery of Australia," which we acquired two years ago.

Mrs. Martha Foss Fleming presented a copy of her interesting booklet, "Old Trails of Maui," sponsored by the William and Mary Alexander Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, 1933. The text shows careful research into the history of paths and trails which met the needs of Hawaiians in the long ago.

"The History of Artesian Wells in the Hawaiian Islands," an illustrated bulletin published in 1917 by the Hawaii Engineering Association, was the gift of the author, Mr. Thomas F. Sedgwick.

The Bishop Museum has not only continued to send us a copy of each new publication, but has given from their duplicate collection two volumes of the "Kuokoa" 1865-1866, and other items which we lacked.

The offer of Mr. Benjamin O. Wist, Dean of Teachers' College, to place in the library a complete set of "Pictures of Old Hawaii," photostat copies of illustrations bearing on Hawaiian history, was gladly accepted.

The last gift recorded is "A Record of the Descendants of David Belden Lyman and Sarah Joiner Lyman, 1832-1933," sent with Christmas greetings from the compilers, Ellen G. Lyman and Elsie H. Wilcox.

In closing I wish to thank all friends of the society who have aided in one way and another to forward this interesting work.

Respectfully submitted,

CAROLINE P. GREEN,  
Librarian.

## HOW THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII GREW AND WHAT DOMAIN IT COVERS

---

By PENROSE CLIBBORN MORRIS

Attorney at Law, Territory of Hawaii.

An Examiner of Land Titles for Land Court of Territory of Hawaii.

Member of Board of Commissioners of Public Archives.

The formation of the Territory of Hawaii has been a process of growth and evolution extending over a period of a century.

It is recognized international law that new territory may be acquired by a State by discovery and occupation, or by cession or conquest. The Territory of Hawaii, successor in title to the Kingdom of Hawaii whose interests and domain have vested in the Territory by annexation, has grown to what it is today by discovery and occupation, and never by cession or conquest, although cession has at times been thought of.

The principle of discovery and occupation has been elaborated and explained by Mr. John Matthewman, a former Attorney General of the Territory, in his opinion dated Oct. 31, 1923, where the law is interpreted as follows:—

“When citizens or subjects of one nation, in its name, and by its authority or with its assent, take and hold actual, continuous and useful possession (although only for the purpose of carrying on a particular business, such as catching and curing fish, or working mines), of territory unoccupied by any other government, or its citizens, the nation to which they belong may exercise such jurisdiction and for such period, as it sees fit over Territory so acquired.”

It will be noted that the jurisdiction may be for such period as the country exercising it may see fit. That is, the occupation may be temporary or permanent. Occupation already had may be abandoned.

The process of consolidation of the Territory of Hawaii, as it now is, has involved temporary occupations, claims that have proved unwarranted and that have been withdrawn, negotiations that were abortive, and claims to Islands that cannot be found to



exist. The process of evolution has ceased in recent years, and the exact lands comprised within the Territory of Hawaii, may now be said to have been at last definitely and finally ascertained, and to be admitted without possibility of reasonable dispute. All foreign claims have been put an end to by annexation. It is the purpose of this paper to show for the first time, from official records, how our Territory came into being as a comprehensive whole, including islands that we know, and others that we have never seen, all "Summer isles of Eden lying in dark-purple spheres of sea," and comprising our Hawaiian heritage.

We do not know when the inhabited Hawaiian Islands were first occupied, but W. D. Alexander, the Historian, points to the discovery of human bones under ancient coral beds and lava flows as evidence that the first settlers must have arrived in very ancient times. Alexander appears to have quoted from Fornander as regards the finding of these human bones. Fornander's facts are open to doubt on this point. However, we may guess that the early inhabitants may have been fugitives from South Pacific Islands, the remnants of defeated armies, or natives who may have drifted long distances from the south in storms, and finally found anchorage in Hawaiian waters. Some facts and speculations relating to the origin of the Hawaiian people, and accounts of ancient Hawaiian voyages are given in the second and third chapters of Alexander's History, to which reference may be had. After the Hawaiian Islands became settled, it seems that the Hawaiian people lived secluded and apart for many generations before intercourse between them and the Islands of the South Pacific was renewed. The eighteenth century was a period of "Traffics and Discoveries," of voyages and explorations. It was undoubtedly by the voyages of Capt. Cook that the Hawaiian Islands were first made generally known to the world.

The question of who is entitled to the honor of their discovery is a more difficult one. This matter has been fully dealt with by the late Bishop Restarick, until recently President of the Hawaiian Historical Society, in his pamphlet, "The Discovery of Hawaii," published in 1930. Bishop Restarick refuted the theory that these islands were discovered by Juan Gaetano, a Spaniard, in 1555. That theory is based on the fact that on some charts taken by Lord

Anson from a Spanish galleon captured during his expedition of 1740 to 1744, there is shown a group of islands designated "Los Monjes," placed between latitude 18 degrees and 22 degrees North, and longitude 135 degrees and 139 degrees West. The position as regards latitude has been thought to point to the conclusion that the group was what is now known as the Hawaiian Islands. Bishop Restarick, after sifting all the evidence, came to the conclusion that "Gaetano did not discover Hawaii, nor did the Spaniards know of the existence of the Hawaiian Islands before Captain Cook discovered them in 1778."

On January 18th, 1778, Captain James Cook of the Royal Navy of Great Britain, sailing northward from Tahiti to North America, first sighted the Hawaiian Islands, and a few days later, landed at Waimea, Kauai. In November following, on a return voyage, Capt. Cook continued his exploration of the Islands. He was killed at Kealahakua Bay on February 14, 1779. The "Resolution" and the "Discovery" left Kealahakua Bay on February 22, 1779, and spent three days making examination of the Hawaiian group, before finally leaving the Islands that Capt. Cook called "the Sandwich Islands" in honor of his patron, the Earl of Sandwich, First Lord of the Admiralty.

The work done by Capt. Cook and his officers was thorough and complete. Immediately after the return of the "Resolution" and "Discovery" to America, charts illustrating the Cook voyages were printed and published the same year. This book of charts may be seen in the Archives Office at Honolulu. It serves to answer positively and finally the question "what portion of the present Territory of Hawaii did Capt. Cook discover?"

The chart of 1779 of the Sandwich Islands and Kealahakua Bay furnishes the answer. Capt. Cook discovered the eight principal Islands, now known by the names of Hawaii, Maui, Molokai, Oahu, Kauai, Lanai, Niihau and Kahoolawe, and also the two very small uninhabited Islands near Niihau, now called Lehua and Kaula, and the small Island called Molokini lying between Maui and Kahoolawe. Other smaller rocks and islets lying close to the shore were not mentioned by Capt. Cook. They may be treated as included in the Hawaiian Islands that he discovered.

Lehua lies about half a mile northward of Niihau. It is a small,

rocky, crescent shaped Island rising to an elevation of about 702 feet near the center. The area of the Island is 277 acres. It is a Light Station of the U. S. Lighthouse Service by Executive Order No. 1851, of the President, dated September 14, 1928.

Kaula lies nineteen miles southwestward of Niihau. It is a small bare, rocky islet about 500 feet high. The area is 108 acres. Kauia is a Light Station of the U. S. Lighthouse Service by Executive Order No. 173 of the Governor of Hawaii, dated December 13, 1924.

Molokini lies in the channel between Maui and Kahoolawe. It is a small, barren, crescent shaped rocky Island, 160 feet high. The area is  $18\frac{1}{2}$  acres. It is a Light Station of the U. S. Lighthouse Service by proclamation of the Governor of Hawaii dated September 13, 1910.

Capt. Cook's chart does not give the present names of the Islands, but they are all placed on the chart with approximate accuracy, and are all clearly capable of being identified with the eight Islands and two rocks near Niihau, and little Island of Molokini, that came under the jurisdiction of Kamehameha the First, when he subjugated the entire Hawaiian group of Islands in the year 1795. They comprise the total area of the Hawaiian Islands as shown on any ordinary small scale map now commonly in use, as for example, the map of the Territory at the beginning of Prof. Alexander's History.

Soon after the beginning of the nineteenth century, some other islands and reefs in the vicinity of the Hawaiian group, but for the most part at considerable distance from the eight main Islands, were discovered. The identity of these islands and reefs, and the history of their incorporation into the Territory of Hawaii, has never been fully known even by citizens of Hawaii. The knowledge has not been available. No accurate, complete and official data has been in existence. Even the best and latest Government charts do not differentiate between what is under Federal and what is under Territorial control.

But such maps are not complete and fully comprehensive to show what is now the Territory of Hawaii.

In this paper we will take for granted knowledge of the Geography and History of the eight large Hawaiian Islands. Any

good history of Hawaii will give the history of these Islands, and the Geography is known to all residents in Hawaii, or should be.\* We will confine ourselves in this paper to a discussion of the coming into the Territory of Hawaii of the smaller islands, reefs and shoals that form part of its domain.

No complete list could now be made were it not for the research of Robert D. King, until recently Territorial Surveyor, and now Chief Surveyor in the combined Land-Survey Office of the Territory. Mr. King, with great industry and special facilities and qualifications for such a task, gathered together in the year 1931, the data for a complete list of the Islands comprised within the Territory of Hawaii. Mr. King has placed at the disposal of the writer of this paper a mass of material bearing upon the subject, and his conclusions on the question of what Islands and reefs now constitute the Territory of Hawaii. King's enumeration is the most complete and accurate list of the Islands, reefs and shoals within the Territory ever made. It represents the geographical and historical facts from Governmental sources. It is an enumeration prepared by an expert, and may be considered the official statement of the Territory of Hawaii, as to what constitutes its domain. King's enumeration comprises all the Islands and rocks that have been shown in this paper to have been discovered by Capt. Cook, all small islands adjacent to the larger islands unnamed by Capt. Cook, particularized in Appendix "A" to this paper, and sixteen islands, reefs and shoals in addition. The present existence of three of these sixteen reefs or shoals is doubtful, and two of them appear from recent survey to be one and the same reef. Thus the number of these small islands, reefs and shoals becomes reduced to twelve that certainly exist at the present time as independent units.

These islands, reefs and shoals were discovered since Capt. Cook's expeditions, and all of the twelve form an integral part of the Territory of Hawaii, beyond a shadow of doubt. They are commonly shown on maps as included in the Leeward Islands of the Hawaiian Archipelago, except Palmyra Island, which lies off the line of the Archipelago that stretches eleven hundred miles

---

\* Professor Kuykendall's History is an excellent history and has good maps.



west northwesterly beyond Kauai. The official names of these Islands, reefs and shoals on modern maps are as follows:

NIHOA

LAYSAN

GARDNER PINNACLES

LISIANSKI ISLAND

KURE (OR OCEAN) ISLAND

NECKER ISLAND

PALMYRA ISLAND

FRENCH FRIGATE SHOAL

BROOKS SHOAL

PEARL AND HERMES REEF

GAMBIA SHOAL

DOWSETT REEF } These two reefs are shown by re-  
MARO REEF } cent survey to be one and the same

FROST SHOAL (Present existence doubtful)

TWO BROTHERS REEF (Present existence doubtful)

MORRELL ISLAND (Present existence doubtful)

It must be clearly understood that the list of islands, reefs and shoals above mentioned, does not include any islands such as Midway and Kingman Reef, and other islands and reefs that are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States. This paper deals exclusively with the islands forming the Territory of Hawaii. The distinction is not a distinction without a difference, but has important legal bearings. This writer is attempting to describe, in the light of present official knowledge, what actually constitutes the domain of the Territory of Hawaii. This paper will be strictly confined to the answer to that question. The above list is, however, to be understood to be sufficiently elastic so as to include all small rocks, reefs and shoals, whether shown on the latest chart of the Coast and Geodetic Survey or not, that are in the close vicinity of the above mentioned twelve islands, reefs and shoals and that may reasonably be treated as appurtenant thereto. Reference will be made hereafter to Johnston Island and Midway Islands, to which the Territory of Hawaii cannot now claim title as against the Federal authorities.

**NIHOA ISLAND** lies 120 miles northwest from Niihau and 247 miles west northwest from Honolulu. The point of highest

elevation is 900 feet above sea level. The north face of the island is a cliff about 850 feet high. It is the highest island of the Hawaiian Leeward group.

Nihoa is a mile long by 2000 feet in width, and contains an area of 155 acres. The Island is clearly volcanic in character, and of great age geologically. There are traditions of early immigrations on a small scale to Nihoa. The evidence of house sites and terraces for cultivation of vegetables, and the finding of various household and fishing appliances lend force to the credibility of these traditions. There is only one landing place situated on the south side.

This Island was discovered on April 13, 1789, by Capt. Douglas of the "Iphigenia." It was taken possession of in 1822 by Capt. William Sumner by direction of Kaahumanu, Premier of the Hawaiian Kingdom.

In 1885 it was visited by Princess Liliuokalani, then heir apparent to the Hawaiian Kingdom, together with a party that included Dr. Sereno E. Bishop. A survey of the Island was made by Dr. Bishop on that occasion. The official name of the Island is Nihoa. It is sometimes called "Moku Manu" or "Bird Island." The old charts showed the name spelled "Modu Manu."

The Island was acquired by the United States under the annexation Act of July 7, 1898, as part of the Territory of Hawaii. See Section 2 of Organic Act and notes upon the said Section at page 64 of the "Revised Laws of Hawaii 1925."

Nihoa Island is under the jurisdiction of the City and County of Honolulu by virtue of Section 1717 of Chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii 1925. The Island is portion of Bird Reservation under concurrent jurisdiction of the United States Department of Agriculture, by virtue of Executive Order No. 1019 of President Theodore Roosevelt dated February 3, 1909. An excellent recent account of Nihoa Island, with full data relating to the history and geography of the Island, is contained in Kenneth P. Emory's Report on the Archaeology of Nihoa and Necker Islands, published by the Bishop Museum in 1928, hereinafter more particularly referred to under Necker Island, and in the bibliography to this paper.

**LAYSAN ISLAND**, sometimes called Moller Island, lies 790 miles northwest of Honolulu. It is not, like Nihoa, of volcanic origin, but is a coral atoll that has become raised by subterranean forces, so that it has become a large briny lake a little elevated above the surrounding ocean, fenced in by a ring of coral sand. This lake is gradually becoming filled up with sand. The Island is almost entirely surrounded by a coral reef. It is about three miles long by one and one-half miles wide, and is not more than 18 feet in height above sea level.

Laysan Island was discovered in 1828 by Capt. Stanikowitch. It was annexed to the Hawaiian Kingdom by Capt. John Paty of the schooner "Manuokawai" on May 1, 1857. The Island harbored quantities of sea birds, and used to be a rich guano deposit. It was leased by the Hawaiian Kingdom to the North Pacific Phosphate and Fertilizer Co., for twenty years from March 29, 1890. Some of the buildings erected by this Company remained when the Island was visited in 1923, by the Biological Survey, who sent in that year an expedition to Laysan and others of the small islands of the Hawaiian group, to investigate and remedy conditions that had arisen by reason of depredations caused by rabbits. The guano deposits have been almost exhausted. The Island, like Nihoa, was annexed to the United States as part of the Territory of Hawaii, and is under the joint jurisdiction of the City and County of Honolulu, and U. S. Department of Agriculture. This Department has jurisdiction over the Island as a Bird Reservation under Executive Order No. 1019.

**GARDNER PINNACLES**, or Gardeners Island, lies 588 miles Northwest by North from Honolulu. It is a volcanic rock 170 feet high, and two hundred yards in diameter. There is a smaller rock close to its southwesterly end. A reef extends about one-half mile. These rocks were discovered by Capt. Allen of the American Whaler "Malo" on June 2, 1820, but on account of the difficulty of landing they have seldom been visited. There is deep water right up to the high cliffs of the main rock. The cliffs are 60 or 70 feet high. Gardner Pinnacles became United States Territory, and passed under the jurisdiction of the City and County of Honolulu and U. S. Department of Agriculture in the same manner as Nihoa and Laysan Islands.

**LISIANSKI ISLAND**,—that is the official name—is also known as Lassion or Pell. It lies 905 miles northwest from Honolulu, and is a sand island about one and one-half miles long by three-fourths of a mile wide. Lisianski rises about 40 feet at the highest point, above sea level. There is a reef partly encircling the Island. Lisianski was discovered by Capt. Lisianski of the “Neva,” on October 15, 1805. It was annexed to the Hawaiian Kingdom by Capt. John Paty of the schooner “Manuokawai” on May 11, 1857. Capt. N. C. Brooks of the Hawaiian Bark “Gambia” visited the Island in 1859.

The Hawaiian Government leased Lisianski to the North Pacific Phosphate and Fertilizer Company for 20 years from March 29, 1890. The Island became United States Territory, and passed under the jurisdiction of the City and County of Honolulu, and U. S. Department of Agriculture in the same manner as Nihoa, Laysan and Gardner. It is included in the Bird Reservation.

**KURE ISLAND** is also referred to unofficially as Ocean, Cure, Staves and Moku Papapa. The term Ocean Island should not be used, as it is confusing. There are many islands of that name. Kure Island lies 1,200 miles northwest from Honolulu, and is a circular atoll, the reef being about 15 miles in circumference, and enclosing two small sand islets. Brackish water is available by digging wells. This Island was visited by Capt. N. C. Brooks of the Hawaiian bark “Gambia” in 1859. Col. J. H. Boyd, Special Commissioner of the Hawaiian monarchy, took possession of Kure Island for the Hawaiian Government on September 20, 1886. See Hawaiian Gazette of October 5, 1886, page 4, and Interior Department Land Matters File of September 26, 1886, on file in the Archives of Hawaii. This Island was leased by the Provisional Government of Hawaii to the North Pacific Phosphate and Fertilizer Company for twenty-five years from February 15, 1894. The Island became United States Territory and passed under the jurisdiction of the City and County of Honolulu, and U. S. Department of Agriculture in the same manner as Nihoa, Laysan, Gardner and Lisianski. It is part of the bird reservation.

**NECKER ISLAND** lies 393 miles northwest from Honolulu, and is the remnant of a volcanic cone. The highest point is 276 feet above sea level.



The Island was discovered by the French navigator La Perouse, in 1786, who named it after the great Minister of Louis XVI. It is about 1,300 yards long by 200 yards wide, and contains 41 acres.

The nearest inhabited land is Niihau, 250 miles distant. Necker Island and Nihoa, near by, were inhabited in ancient times by Polynesian visitants who have left behind them evidence of their work and culture. Edwin H. Bryan, Jr., Curator of Collections of the Bishop Museum, was of a scientific party who visited Necker Island in June, 1923. In an account of this visit, published in his "Hawaiian Nature Notes," Bryan says:—

"It seemed to us incredible that any group of people could have existed here for any length of time, but the evidence of them, and their work was all about us. First, there were the terraces, not those carved out by nature, but some thirty-four large, paved platforms, the work of men's hands. Each had a more or less well-preserved row of upright stones on a raised platform at one end, and other upright slabs here and there. There is nothing just like them," says Bryan, "to be found today in the main islands of the Hawaiian group, nor are such temple structures (if they are temples) known to the Hawaiians of today, even in tradition. \* \* \* Then there were the artifacts, beautiful bowls, laboriously hollowed from the hard, but brittle rock of the island, stone adzes, sinkers, a stone awl, a hammer stone, a grindstone, and human bones. All these," says Bryan, "evidenced a settlement of some time by people very like the Hawaiians." Curious idols were also found, six of them being now preserved in the Bishop Museum.

The question as to who were these early inhabitants of Necker Island and Nihoa has been thoroughly explored by Kenneth P. Emory, Ethnologist of the Bishop Museum in his report before referred to, published by the Museum, entitled, "Archaeology of Nihoa and Necker Islands," Bishop Museum Bulletin No. 53. Emory expresses the opinion that these early inhabitants of Necker and Nihoa were some of the ancient inhabitants of the main Hawaiian Islands. Emory's Report gives a very full account of the Geography and History of the Island.

Necker Island was visited by Capt. N. C. Brooks of the Hawaiian bark "Gambia" in April, 1859, and was annexed to the Pro-

visional Government of Hawaii by Capt. J. A. King, Minister of the Interior, father of Robert D. King, on May 26, 1894. This annexation was decided upon very suddenly. It is alleged that the Hawaiian Government discovered the secret plan of Great Britain to send Her Britannic Majesty's ship "Champion," then in Honolulu harbor, to annex Necker Island, as a link in the "All-British" cable landings, between Canada and Australia. The "Iwalani," under Capt. King, left Honolulu for Necker Island at 3 p. m. May 25, 1894. The "Champion" left at 6 p. m. the same day. The "Iwalani" reached Necker Island first, and the annexation or re-annexation to Hawaii was carried into effect with due ceremony.

The writer of this paper has often heard the story of the annexation told by an eye-witness, the late Capt. James Gregory, who for many years prior to his death was Captain of the Inter-Island Steamer "Kinau." At the time of the annexation, Capt. Gregory—James, and not William, as has been incorrectly stated,—was in the American merchant marine service, and accompanied Capt. King on the expedition. A photograph of the annexation ceremony was taken by a member of the party, and a copy of this picture contained in Emory's monograph before referred to, shows the act of raising of the Hawaiian flag over Necker Island.

The Island was acquired by the United States on annexation of the Hawaiian Islands. It was leased by the Territory of Hawaii for twenty-one years from June 2, 1904, for fishing purposes only.

It is part of the Bird Reservation, and is under the joint jurisdiction of the City and County of Honolulu and the U. S. Department of Agriculture, pursuant to the laws and executive order hereinbefore referred to as affecting the other five Islands whose history has been detailed.

**PALMYRA ISLAND**, sometimes called Samarang or Palmoore Island, is located 960 miles south by west from Honolulu, and lies outside the natural line of the Hawaiian Archipelago. The Island is an atoll consisting of approximately 52 islets occupying a space of five and two-thirds miles by one and one-half miles. The reef extends nearly eight miles. The atoll incloses three lagoons. The several islets are low above sea level, and covered with bush and coconut trees. The islets vary in size from 46 acres to about one-half acre. The Island depends on the rainfall for a water

supply. Palmyra was discovered by Capt. Sawle, of the American vessel "Palmyra," on November 7, 1802. Dr. G. P. Judd, agent for American Guano Co., took possession for the United States on October 19, 1859. The Island was annexed for the Hawaiian Kingdom by Capt. Zenas Bent, of Honolulu, in 1862. It was annexed by Great Britain on May 28, 1889, by Commander Nichols of the British man of war "Cormorant." The proclamation of 1862, issued under Kamehameha IV, was as follows:—

"Whereas, on the fifteenth day of April, 1862, Palmyra Island, in lat. 5 deg. 50 min. N. and long. 161 deg. 53 min. W. was taken possession of with the usual formalities by Capt. Zenas Bent, he being duly authorized to do so in the name of Kamehameha IV, King of the Hawaiian Islands.

Therefore, This is to give notice that the said Island so taken possession of is henceforth to be considered and respected as part of the domain of the King of the Hawaiian Islands.

(SIGNED) L. KAMEHAMEHA,  
Minister of the Interior  
Department of Interior, June 18, 1862."

It has been generally understood that Palmyra Island was one of the Hawaiian Islands that passed to the United States on annexation. Any possible doubt that the Island is American Territory was set at rest by the formal annexation of Palmyra Island to the United States by Admiral Sutherland, U. S. N., the Commander in Chief of the Pacific Fleet in the year 1912. The jurisdiction, however, lies in the Territory of Hawaii. The City and County of Honolulu collect the taxes and the title is registered in the Land Court of the Territory of Hawaii, under the Land Registration Act, (Revised Laws of Hawaii 1925, Chapter 186 as amended). The number of the original petition for land registration was No. 223. The files in the Land Court matter give a complete resume of the various changes of private ownership from the time of Capt. Zenas Bent in the year 1862 down to the present time, when the entire group of Islets known as Palmyra Island, has become vested in Mr. and Mrs. Fullard-Leo of Honolulu, under Land Court Certificate No. 2116, save and except two islets known as "Home Islands," which are registered in the names of certain devisees of the late Henry E. Cooper under Land Court Certificate No. 9756. The owners of the two islets and those who may

accompany them, have the right, under the decree of the Land Court, to the navigation of the lagoon with boats and other craft, and free passage about the lagoon and reefs, and the taking of fish for domestic purposes only while in residence upon the Island.

A full account of the early history of Palmyra Island will be found in Prof. Rock's pamphlet, entitled "Palmyra Island with a description of its flora," published in the year 1916 by the College of Hawaii as Bulletin No. 4. This pamphlet contains some photographs of Palmyra scenery. From this authority it appears that the Pacific Navigation Company sent a man named Dillon in September, 1885, under contract for one year, to Palmyra Island. He agreed during that period to cut firewood, catch shark, fish and birds, and plant coconuts, and try to find pearl shell and coral. Dillon and his wife remained on Palmyra for a year, and returned to Honolulu at the end of 1886, or beginning of 1887. Prof. Rock reported that in the year 1916 the Island was covered with at least 25,000 bearing coconut trees. According to Prof. Rock there are many hermit crabs and coconut crabs on Palmyra, but no mosquitos.

The Island has been visited from time to time by the owners and others interested in exploring the commercial possibilities and the beauties of this gem of a Pacific Island. This writer understands that the only lengthy settlement, since the time that Dillon and his wife lived on Palmyra, occurred in the years 1920 to 1921. From October, 1920, to December, 1921, Colonel William Meng and Edwin Benner, Jr., lived on the Island. Mrs. Meng was also of the party in residence for ten months of that period. The party investigated the possibilities of the Island for copra production and fishing.

Benner has informed the writer that during the term of residence of his party, the rainfall was plentiful, and the question of water supply presented no difficulty. The climate of Palmyra is delightful.

**FRENCH FRIGATE SHOAL** or French Frigates Shoal lies 480 miles northwest from Honolulu, and is roughly a crescent-shaped atoll about twelve and one-half miles in length, or according to the Bishop Museum Geologist Harold S. Palmer, who visited the shoal, about ten years ago, it is 17 miles in length. The shoal



is about five miles wide at the widest point. French Frigate Shoal comprises within the the lagoon a group of thirteen small sand islets, and one rocky islet known as La Perouse Pinnacle 120 feet high. Landings are easy on the sand islets. French Frigate Shoal was discovered by La Perouse on November 6, 1786, and visited by Capt. N. C. Brooks of the Hawaiian bark "Gambia" in 1859. The Shoal was leased by the Provisional Government of Hawaii for twenty-five years from February 15, 1894. A formal annexation by the Republic of Hawaii took place on July 13, 1895. Particulars of the act of annexation are contained in the official report of Capt. J. A. King to President Dole, dated July 22, 1895, on file in the Archives Office.

The French Frigate Shoal was acquired by the United States under the Annexation Act of July 7, 1898, as part of the Territory of Hawaii. See Sec. 2 of Organic Act, and notes upon said Section at page 64 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1925.

The City and County of Honolulu has jurisdiction by virtue of Sec. 1717 of Chapter 118 Revised Laws of Hawaii 1925. The Shoal is portion of Bird Reservation under concurrent jurisdiction of the United States Department of Agriculture, by virtue of Executive Order No. 1019.

**BROOKS SHOAL**, 30 miles west-northwest of French Frigate Shoal, is an oblong bank about fourteen miles long. This Shoal was discovered by Capt. N. C. Brooks of the Hawaiian bark "Gambia" in 1859. It was visited by the Coast and Geodetic Survey ship Albatross in 1902. The ownership is credited to the Territory of Hawaii, and the jurisdiction to the City and County of Honolulu concurrently with U. S. Department of Agriculture. It is presumed that Brooks Shoal is included in Bird Reservation, although not expressly mentioned in Executive Order No. 1019.

**PEARL AND HERMES REEF**, like Maro Reef, is listed by Doctor Thomas G. Thrum, as an Hawaiian possession. See Hawaiian Annual for 1898. It lies 1,050 miles northwest of Honolulu and is an oblong shaped atoll. The reef encloses an area of about 8 miles in length by two and one-half miles in width at the center. Five small sand islets are located within the circumference of the reef. The average height of the islets is ten feet at their highest points.

In the year 1822 two whalers, the "Pearl," and the "Hermes," were wrecked the same night within a few miles of each other on this reef. Out of the broken timbers, James Robinson, carpenter, and others of the crew, built a boat that carried them to Honolulu. Robinson established a ship-building business at what is now part of Pier 13, and built Robinson's Wharf on Honolulu Harbor. He became wealthy; and his descendants are highly respected kamaaina residents of Honolulu.

John Paty observed and mapped the position of Pearl and Hermes Reef in 1857, but did not land.

The reef was leased by the Provisional Government of Hawaii to the North Pacific Phosphate and Fertilizer Company for twenty-five years from February 15, 1894. The ownership and jurisdiction of this reef correspond to the ownership and jurisdiction of Nihoa and Laysan and other reefs in the same category hereinbefore mentioned. The reef is part of Bird Reservation.

**GAMBIA SHOAL**, situated about 35 miles west by north from Pearl and Hermes Reef, is covered by fourteen fathoms of water. It was discovered by Capt. N. C. Brooks of the Hawaiian bark "Gambia" in 1859. The ownership and jurisdiction are the same as in the case of Nihoa and Laysan and other reefs in the same category.

**DOWSETT REEF**, so called because on July 4, 1872, the whaling brig "Kamehameha," Capt. Dowsett, struck on this reef, is located between Laysan and Gardner Pinnacles, lying 133 miles west-quarter-south from the latter rocks. It is a rectangular coral reef about nine miles long and five miles wide. Dowsett Reef is nearly always entirely covered by breakers. The ownership and jurisdiction are the same as in the case of Nihoa and Laysan. It is mentioned in Executive Order No. 1019 as part of Bird Reservation.

**MARO REEF**, or Mary Reef, was discovered by Capt. Allen of the American whaler "Malo" in 1820. It lies about ten miles northwest of Dowsett Reef, and is a rectangular coral reef about nine miles long, by five miles wide, usually covered with breakers. This reef was listed as an Hawaiian possession by the late historian, Thomas G. Thrum. See Hawaiian Annual for 1898. Maro Reef is

included as a part of Bird Reservation. (Executive Order No. 1019.) The ownership and jurisdiction are as in the case of Nihoa and Laysan.

The Geodetic Survey Map published June, 1931, treats Dowsett and Maro Reefs as one and the same reef.

**FROST SHOAL**, 90 miles west northwest from Nihoa was discovered by the ship "E. L. Frost" in 1859. The U. S. S. "Yorktown" passed over it on October 14, 1897, since which date this shoal has been searched for without success. Frost Shoal, when located, was found near Necker Island. The ownership was credited to the Territory of Hawaii by reference in Executive Order No. 1019 creating a Bird Reservation. The jurisdiction would be in the City and County of Honolulu, concurrently with the U. S. Department of Agriculture, as in the case of Nihoa and Laysan. This shoal is not shown on Chart of Geodetic Survey dated June, 1931.

**TWO BROTHERS REEF** is shown on the charts in latitude 24 deg. 14 min. N., longitude 168 deg. 28 min. W. This reef took its name from the Captain of the Nantucket whaler, "Two Brothers," who reported striking the reef in 1823. The supposed reef has been searched for several times during the past century, but has never been located. If it exists, this shoal forms part of the Territory of Hawaii, with jurisdiction the same as in the case of Nihoa and Laysan.

This reef is not shown on Chart of Geodetic Survey of June, 1931. It is mentioned in Executive Order No. 1019 as part of the Bird Reservation.

**MORRELL ISLAND** was reported to exist by Capt. Morrell in the year 1825, at latitude 29 deg. 57 min. N., longitude 174 deg. 31 min. E. Its existence has been reported as doubtful. It has not been seen for many years, and has been expunged from the admiralty charts. Morrell Island was included in a twenty-five year lease by Hawaiian Government to North Pacific Phosphate and Fertilizer Company, dated February 15, 1894. This Island is not specifically included in Bird Reservation. It is not shown on the chart of the Geodetic Survey dated June, 1931. The Chart does not, however, extend to cover its location.

The commentators note to Section 2 of the Organic Act, Revised Laws of Hawaii 1925, page 64, in listing the Hawaiian Islands omits to name the eight shoals and reefs, that have been lastly described, namely, Brooks Shoal, Pearl and Hermes Reef, Gambia Shoal, Dowsett Reef, Maro Reef, Frost Shoal, Two Brothers Reef and Morrell Island. William Alanson Bryan in his list of the Hawaiian Islands, at page 93 of his "Natural History of Hawaii," omits Palmyra, Brooks Shoal, Two Brothers Reef and Morrell Island, but he includes Midway, which is not, however, part of the Territory of Hawaii, but is under the jurisdiction and control of the Navy Department of the United States, independent of this Territory, by virtue of Executive Order of President Theodore Roosevelt dated January 20, 1903, followed by possession and occupancy as a cable station.

Other lists have been published purporting to name the Hawaiian Islands, but for the lack of official data in existence, none of these lists have been fully comprehensive and exact.

It will be seen from the description that has been given of the shoals, reefs and atolls omitted in the above two fairly representative lists, that the omissions do not in any case except Palmyra, represent territory of much apparent value and importance at the present time, and some of the omissions relate to reefs that appear to be nonexistent. However, what is the apparent value, is not always the real value. Anything that is written on the subject of "How the Territory of Hawaii Grew," should give credit to the industrious coral forming polyp, slow working though it be, and to the forces of nature that tend to change the level of land, especially that of the ocean swept Pacific Islands. Subsidences have occurred, but likewise land coral reefs have risen. Dr. Brigham of the Bishop Museum was responsible for the statement made in the year 1900 that on this Island of Oahu the ancient coral reef was at that time from two to three fathoms above the level at which it was formed not many ages ago. The growth by the coral insect is, of course, extremely slow and restricted to a depth not exceeding 150 feet. But volcanic and seismological disturbances may cause quicker changes in elevation. If the contrary action is taking place, and the theory is sound, that the islands and shoals that have been described were formerly high, volcanic islands that



have been leveled and in some cases submerged by the combined action of wind, rain and wave erosion, then, in that case, the action of nature is also very slow. For the world of today the islands and shoals are existing facts to be taken into account and valued for whatever value they may now possess. These sea-swept and isolated oases of terra firma on the vast bosom of the Pacific Ocean, part of our Territory, have ceased to possess much value now as guano deposits, but are mainly of value to the fisherman and scientist, and possibly for naval or cable purposes. It might not be at all for the well being of this Territory and the Coast of California, that these little dots on the map of the great Pacific should fall into the possession of some other nation than America. Indeed, it is quite possible that one or more of these islands may yet become very useful, like Midway. It is also to be remembered that these small islands of the Hawaiian Archipelago have been constituted by the American Government to form the Hawaiian Islands Bird Reservation, the largest and most populous bird colony in the world. That makes them of interest to naturalists. They have a scientific value to the student. Prof. Bryan, in his *Natural History*, reminded us that the formation and growth of coral islands and reefs, has been a subject profound enough to engage the attention of such thinkers as Darwin, Agassiz, Dana, Wallace and a score of others.

The American Navy and Merchant Marine and other navies and merchant marines are vitally interested in watching and charting all land, rocks and submerged reefs that may prove a menace to navigation.

In the foregoing paper, attention has been called to the fact that while the action of the coral insect as an upbuilding force, and the combined action of wind, rain and wave erosion, as a destructive force is very slow, seismological disturbances may cause quicker changes.

A copyrighted article by G. K. Spencer from the Philadelphia "Public Ledger," reprinted locally in the "Advertiser" of December 10, 1933, contains some interesting data and somewhat speculative theories regarding the effect of seismographical disturbances in the Pacific Ocean.

Thus, it will be seen that from various points of view, the out-

lying islands of the Territory of Hawaii, and even submerged reefs, are now of real importance, and may easily become of tremendous importance.

Hawaii must not forget these smaller members of her family of "sunny isles in summer seas." Periodical supervision is essential, and continuous, and where possible, useful possession must continue to be manifested. Neglect in the past has led to damage and destruction of bird life. In the year 1910, Japanese poachers were discovered on Laysan and Lisianski engaged in wholesale mutilation and slaughter of the birds for commercial purposes. In 1923 the Biological Survey was compelled to send the "Tanager" to Laysan, and as already stated, to investigate and remedy the destruction of all vegetation and threatened extinction of bird life on that Island by reason of rabbits that had been left to run wild and multiply by the manager of a guano company who had formerly occupied the Island.

It remains to discuss the status of Johnston Island, whose title in the Territory of Hawaii was for long considered doubtful.

**JOHNSTON ISLAND** lies 717 miles southwest from Honolulu. It is a lagoon, the reef being about eight miles long. On the reef are two islands, the larger one, Johnston Island, being about one-half mile long. The small one, sand Island, is a mere sand bank about five hundred yards in diameter. Both Islands are covered with grass. Brackish water is obtainable. The Islands have easy landings. Johnston Island was discovered on December 14, 1807, by His Britannic Majesty's Ship "Cornwallis," and named after the captain of the ship. On March 19, 1858, this Island was taken possession of for the United States by the captain of the American Schooner "Palestine." On June 14, 1858, possession was taken for the Hawaiian Kingdom by the Hawaiian Schooner "Kalama." On July 22, 1858, repossession was taken by the Schooner "Palestine." On July 27, 1858, the Island was formally annexed to Hawaii by proclamation of Kamehameha IV, and was leased by the Territory of Hawaii to Max Schlemmer for 15 years from September 11, 1909. Johnston Island is a Bird Reservation by Executive Order of President Calvin Coolidge dated June 29, 1926, No. 4467.

This Island is admittedly American. Hawaii does not seem to

have pressed its claim to have jurisdiction over it. Jurisdiction, therefore, appears now to be in the United States Government. That was the opinion of Attorney General Black of the United States, written to the Secretary of the Navy so far back as on July 9, 1859—(9 op. Atty. Genl. of U. S. No. 364), in which opinion it is stated, that at the date of the Royal Proclamation of Kamehameha IV, Johnston Island was in actual possession of American citizens holding in the name and under the flag of the United States.

#### **OTHER REEFS SHOWN ON MAP OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY:**

Coast and Geodetic Survey Chart dated June, 1931, has located thereon St. Rogatien Bank as lying about 70 miles northwest of French Frigate Shoal, and Raita Bank as lying about 95 miles northwest of Gardner Pinnacles. This Chart also shows an unnamed reef stretching westward from Nihoa, a small unnamed reef lying between Nihoa and Niihau, a small shoal marked "Nero Bank" lying south of Kure Island, and a small reef marked as "Bensaleux Reef" lying south of Kure Island. These shoals and reefs may be regarded as comparatively recent discoveries. They are all undoubtedly under American jurisdiction. They have no history so far as the Territory of Hawaii is concerned, and are not under Territorial jurisdiction.

This paper cannot be extended further to trace the history of temporary occupations, claims that have proved unwarranted, and that have been withdrawn by Hawaii, negotiations that were abortive, and claims that were made to islands that could not be found to exist. Particulars regarding such matters may be found in the Archives Office.

There is so much opinion in the street, however, to the effect that Midway belonged to Hawaii, and is now part of the Territory, that it seems of interest to refer further to the matter.

Midway comprises two small sand islands in a lagoon, encircled by a coral reef. The statement has often come, even from authoritative sources, and has frequently been repeated, that the Territory of Hawaii extends from Midway on the North, to Palmyra on the South. Midway is, however, not a part of the Territory of Hawaii. The legal question involved in deciding the

matter was whether Midway was acquired by Hawaii on July 5, 1859, when discovered by Capt. N. C. Brooks, of the Hawaiian bark "Gambia," and was therefore a part of the Territory, or whether it was acquired by the United States independently when annexed and surveyed by the U. S. S. "Lackawanna" on August 28, 1867. The latter fact was assumed by the Supreme Court of the United States on May 27, 1901, in *Downes v. Bidwell*, 182 U. S. 304 (45 U. S. L. Ed.) 1088; 1113. The whole question was explored by Opinion No. 1098 of the Attorney General of Hawaii, dated October 31, 1923. The conclusion of the Attorney General was, that "If the Kingdom of Hawaii ever had a valid claim to Midway—which appears unlikely—it was certainly abandoned. Hence the Territory of Hawaii succeeded to, and holds, no rights over those two Islands."

The Midway Islands are now, as already stated, under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department of the United States. The Navy Department has appointed the Superintendent of the Cable Company as Naval Custodian. The Territory of Hawaii does not collect taxes from the Cable Company employees, and has no jurisdiction over the Islands.

To sum up, therefore, it appears from the foregoing that it can be now definitely stated—that the official records and maps show that at the present time the Territory of Hawaii covers and includes the following Islands, reefs and shoals:—

The eight main inhabited Islands, with Lehua, Kaula and Molokini adjoining.

All small rocks, reefs and shoals adjacent to the foregoing as specified in Appendix A, next following.

The twelve Islands, reefs and shoals whose history has been detailed in this paper, and whose present existence has been shown to have been verified by recent survey. Frost Shoal, Two Brothers Reef, and Morrell Island, it is assumed, can be eliminated as non existent; and Dowsett Reef and Maro Reef, it is assumed, can be treated as one and the same reef. Should it prove otherwise, these shoals and reefs will all form part of the Territory of Hawaii.

All rocks, reefs and shoals in the vicinity of the twelve Islands, reefs and shoals above referred to, that may now exist, or may hereafter be found to exist appurtenant thereto.

## APPENDIX "A"

List of islets lying offshore from the main inhabited Hawaiian Islands—Compiled by Robt. D. King, Chief Surveyor Land-Survey Office of the Territory of Hawaii at Honolulu.

## OFF ISLAND OF HAWAII

There are no small islets offshore from the Island of Hawaii, excepting Mokuola or Coconut Island in Hilo Bay, which has been used as a public park for many years. (Reg. Map No. 1561); the rock Paalaea and islets Paoakalani and Mokupuka or Mokupuku off the northeast coast, opposite the land of Awini in North Kohala (Reg. Map No. 1876 and U. S. Geological Survey Map of Waipio quadrangle); and the islet Kēaoi off the southeast coast near the Keauhou-Kapapala boundary. (U. S. Geological Survey Map of Kilauea quadrangle.)

## OFF ISLAND OF MAUI

On the south coast of East Maui the only important islets are Alau Island, three-eighths mile offshore from the land of Aleamai in Hana district, and Ahole Rock, about one-fourth mile offshore from Kipahulu village.

Between Pauwela Point and Kauiki Head, along the north coast of East Maui, are a number of rocks and islets close inshore, the most important of which are Papanui o Kane in Uaoa Bay; Keopuka Island, about 140 feet high, lying off Moiki point in the land of Keopuka, Koolau District; Aluea Rock, in Wailua Bay; and an unnamed islet southeast of Opikoula in Koolau District.

There are no islets off the south coast of West Maui; off the north coast of West Maui there are numerous small islets extending from Nakalele Point to Waihee Point, the most important of which are Mahinanui, Mokeehia, Kaemi and Hulu. (U. S. Geological Survey Map of Maui.) Puukii Island lies just north of Kauiki Head on the south side of the entrance of Hana Harbor, U. S. Light Station reservation by Executive Order No. 826 of President dated December 4, 1908.

The Island of Molokini has been described in the text of the foregoing paper.



## OFF ISLAND OF KAHOO LAWE

The only islet offshore from Kahoolawe lies off the south coast just west of Kamohio Bay; it is called Puukoa, and has an altitude of 378 feet. (U. S. Geological Survey Map of Kahoolawe.) The Island of Molokini has been described in the text of the foregoing paper.

## OFF ISLAND OF LANAI

There are no rocks or islets offshore from Lanai, except Puupehe Rock, in Manele Bay, on the south coast, and Five Needles, or Nanahoa, a group of pinnacle rocks from 40 to 128 feet high lying just north of Honopu Bay on the west coast. (U. S. Geological Survey Map of Lanai.)

## OFF ISLAND OF MOLOKAI

Mokuhooniki is a small, yellow, bare rocky islet with perpendicular sides about 200 feet high lying about one mile offshore and two miles southward of the northeasterly point of Molokai. It is a Territorial Bird Reservation. (Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1925, Section 742.) Kanaha Rock, about 95 feet high, lies just southwestward of Mokuhooniki. (Coast and Geodetic Survey Serial No. 227, P. 35.)

Off the north coast and between Makanalua peninsula and Cape Halawa are the following rocks and islets: Mokapu Island, elevation 360 feet, and Okala Island, elevation 370 feet, off Leinapio Point; Mokolea and Mokohola Islands near Pelekunu Bay, and Mokupapapa in Halawa Bay. (U. S. Geological Survey Map of Molokai.)

## OFF ISLAND OF OAHU

Islets off the south coast of Oahu comprise Sand and Quarantine Islands in Honolulu Harbor (U. S. Public Health and Military Reservations, see Presidential Executive Order No. 3358, dated November 24, 1920); Mokauea and Mokuoeo near the entrance to Kalihi Bay; and Moku Umeume or Ford's Island (U. S. Military and Naval Reservations) in the east loch, and Laulaunui in the west loch of Pearl Harbor.

Islets off the northeast coast of Oahu are Kihewamoku, Moku-  
auia, Pulemoku, Kukuihoolua and Mokualai, lying off Laie Bay  
and north of Laie Point; Mokolii, off Kualoa point at the north end  
of Kaneohe Bay; Kapapa (Territorial Bird Reservation), Ahu o  
Laka, Kekepa and Moku o Loe in Kaneohe Bay; and between  
Mokapu Point and Makapuu Head, Moku Manu (two islets),  
Mokolea Rock, Popoia, Mokolua (two islets), Manana and Ka-  
ohikaipu, all of the six latter, excepting Mokolea Rock, being Ter-  
ritorial Bird Reservations; see Revised Laws of Hawaii 1925  
Section 742. (U. S. Geological Survey Map of Oahu.)

#### OFF ISLAND OF KAUAI

The only islet or rock off the south coast of Kauai is Lani-  
puao or Kalanipua Rock which is covered with about three feet  
of water, and lies three-eighths mile southwestward of Hinalua or  
Makaokahai Point in the land of Kalaheo, Koloa District. It is  
marked by a red nun buoy.

The only islet off the north coast of Kauai is Mokuiaee Island,  
which lies about 200 yards offshore from Lae o Kilauea in the land  
of Kilauea, Hanalei District. It is a black rock about 100 feet high  
and about five acres in area. Light House Station by proclamation  
of the Governor of Hawaii, dated January 21, 1910. (U. S.  
Geological Survey Map of Kauai.)

#### OFF ISLAND OF NIIHAU

The only islets off the coast of Niihau are the two islets of  
Lehua and Kaula, already described in text of foregoing paper.

## APPENDIX "B"

## BIBLIOGRAPHY AND AUTHORITIES.

*Taylor's Compilation.*—Islands of the Hawaiian Domain. Typewritten statement prepared by A. P. Taylor, Librarian Archives of Hawaii, in January, 1931.

This compilation is on file in the Archives Office. It contains copies of all the material gathered by the late A. P. Taylor from the files of the Archives Office bearing upon the question as to what Islands comprise the Territory of Hawaii, and includes copies of all official documents and newspaper material that were discovered by Taylor by careful search of the Hawaiian Public records, together with photostat copy of the Journal of a voyage in the schooner "Manuokawai" in April and May, 1857. As a volume of source material, this compilation is valuable and essential, although it does not attempt to give a final and decisive list of the Hawaiian Islands.

*Robert D. King*, sometime Territorial Surveyor for the Territory of Hawaii, and now Chief Surveyor of the Land-Survey Office of the Territory of Hawaii, has explored all available sources of information in Honolulu, and has furnished the writer with the results of his researches and conclusions concerning the ownership of the Islands and near what is commonly referred to as the Hawaiian Archipelago. The data furnished to the writer by King is the main but not exclusive source of information relied on in the preparation of this paper. The principal published sources of information are the following:—

*The Hawaiian Islands and the Islands, Rocks and Shoals to the Westward*, 1903. Second Edition; published by the Hydrographic Office of the U. S. Navy.

*Pacific Islands Pilot*, Volume I, 1920.

(Western Groups) Second Edition; published by the Hydrographic office of the U. S. Navy.

*Pacific Islands Pilot*. Volume II, 1926.

(Eastern Groups) Third Edition; published by the Hydrographic Office of the U. S. Navy.

*U. S. Coast Pilot*. The Hawaiian Islands. Published by the U. S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, Serial No. 227 and Supplements, Serial Nos. 458 and 489.

*Joint Resolution of Annexation* approved by the President of the United States July 7, 1898. Thirty Statutes at Large. (2 Supp. R. S. 895).

*Bishop Museum Bulletin No. 35.*

Geology of Kaula, Nihoa, Necker and Gardner Islands and French Frigate Shoals. By Harold S. Palmer. Tanager Expedition. Publication No. 4. Published 1927. Contains the most recent geological data on aforesaid five islands and shoals.

*Bishop Museum Bulletin No. 53.*

Archaeology of Nihoa and Necker Islands. By Kenneth P. Emory. Tanager Expedition. Publication No. 5. Published 1928. Very full and complete.

*Bishop Museum Publication No. 44.*

Being Whippoorwill Expedition Publication No. 2, by Erling Christopherson. Contains chapter on soils of Palmyra in relation to the vegetation. This pamphlet was published in 1927 by the Bishop Museum.

*Revised Laws of Hawaii dated 1925*, being the most recent codification of Hawaiian Statutes.

*Index to the Islands of the Pacific.*

By William T. Brigham, A.M. Memoirs of B. P. Bishop Museum, Volume 1, No. 2.

*"Natural History of Hawaii."*

By William Alanson Bryan, published in 1915. Contains an interesting and popular account of some of the Islands of the Hawaiian Archipelago at pages 93 to 99.

*"Hawaiian Nature Notes"*

By E. H. Bryan, Jr. Published 1933. Contains interesting chapters on several Islands of the Hawaiian group, including a description of Necker Island.

*"Palmyra Island, with description of its flora."*

By Prof. J. F. Rock. Published in 1916 as Bulletin No. 4 by the College of Hawaii.

*Several scientific bulletins* relating to certain of the Islands of the Hawaiian Archipelago have been published by the Bishop Museum. See Bulletins Nos. 21 and 44 and also Nos. 35 and 53 before referred to.

*The latest chart, dated June 1931 of the Geodetic Survey* is the best and latest map available in Honolulu covering the subject of this paper. It was made as the result of discovery and soundings on the Pacific Ocean. In general it includes the list of Islands given by Mr. King, with the differences that have been referred to in text of foregoing paper. It does not differentiate between the Islands and reefs that like Midway belong to America, but are not part of the Territory of Hawaii, and those that are included within the Territory. The Chart is therefore not quite correctly entitled "The Territory of Hawaii." There would be practical difficulties, however, in coloring any small scale chart such as the Geodetic Chart of June, 1931 (No. 4000), so as to differentiate between what is Federal and what is Territorial property. The leeward islands of the Hawaiian group appear so very small on a chart of such a scale as to make it almost impossible to color them. Also, it would be contrary, perhaps, to usage to color on any chart such reefs and shoals as are covered by water. If it is desired to have a small scale chart or map to show the Territory of Hawaii fully and completely, then the only way to do it would seem to be to have the chart or map show the jurisdiction of the various islands, reefs and shoals by appropriate legends. A large scale chart or map would enable the Territorial possessions to be colored. But such a map would be unwieldy.

This Chart of June, 1931, has been relied on as an important source of information in the preparation of the foregoing paper. But the effort has been made to supplement the data that is furnished by the historical data officially available from the Public records in Honolulu. In particular an endeavor has been made in the foregoing paper finally and decisively for the first time to differentiate and distinguish the islands that are under the jurisdiction of the Territory of Hawaii, from the general class of American-owned Pacific Islands.

## APPENDIX "C"

LATITUDE AND LONGITUDE OF FOREGOING SIXTEEN  
ISLANDS, REEFS AND SHOALS.

|                                | <i>Latitude</i> |    | <i>Longitude</i> |    |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|----|------------------|----|
| BROOKS SHOAL .....             | 24° 10'         | N. | 166° 53'         | W. |
| DOWSETT REEF .....             | 25° 20'         | N. | 170° 30'         | W. |
| FRENCH FRIGATE<br>SHOAL .....  | 25° 46'         | N. | 166° 18'         | W. |
| FROST SHOAL .....              | 23° 45'         | N. | 163° 25'         | W. |
| GAMBIA SHOAL .....             | 28° 07'         | N. | 176° 38'         | W. |
| GARDNER PIN-<br>NACLES .....   | 25° 01'         | N. | 167° 59'         | W. |
| KURE (OR OCEAN)....            | 28° 25'         | N. | 178° 25'         | W. |
| LAYSAN .....                   | 25° 42' 14"     | N. | 171° 44' 06"     | W. |
| LISIANSKI .....                | 26° 01' 22"     | N. | 173° 59' 15"     | W. |
| MARO REEF .....                | 25° 29'         | N. | 170° 35'         | W. |
| MORRELL ISLAND.....            | 29° 57'         | N. | 174° 31'         | E. |
| NECKER .....                   | 23° 34' 41"     | N. | 164° 42' 22"     | W. |
| NIHOA .....                    | 23° 03' 29"     | N. | 161° 55' 25"     | W. |
| PALMYRA .....                  | 5° 53'          | N. | 162° 05'         | W. |
| PEARL AND HERMES<br>REEF ..... | 27° 48'         | N. | 175° 51'         | W. |
| TWO BROTHERS<br>REEF .....     | 24° 14'         | N. | 168° 28'         | W. |



# HONOLULU AND SOME NEW SPECULATIVE PHASES OF HAWAIIAN HISTORY

BY JOHN F. G. STOKES

Formerly Curator of Polynesian Ethnology and Curator-in-Charge  
of the Bernice P. Bishop Museum, Honolulu.

## CONTENTS

|  |           |    |
|--|-----------|----|
| INTRODUCTION                               | - - - - - | 40 |
| MODERN AND ANCIENT IMPORTANCE OF HONOLULU  | - - - - - | 41 |
| NO GREAT ANTIQUITY OF SETTLEMENT           | - - - - - | 48 |
| EARLY NAMES OF HONOLULU AND THEIR ORIGIN   | - - - - - | 51 |
| DISCOVERY OF HONOLULU HARBOR BY FOREIGNERS | - - - - - | 61 |
| THE <i>Haole</i> PROPRIETOR OF OAHU        | - - - - - | 73 |
| REVIEW OF COMMENTS ON "A NORTHWEST TRADER" | - - - - - | 85 |
| PLANS FOR HAWAIIAN ANNEXATIONS             | - - - - - | 87 |
| SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES                        | - - - - - | 97 |
| LIST OF REFERENCES                         | - - - - - | 99 |

## INTRODUCTION

Source material for Hawaiian history of the eighteenth century has only recently been sought in journal entries on the Northwest Coast of America. In this research, the Society's honorary member, Judge F. W. Howay of British Columbia, has been conspicuous.

Most vessels sailing through the North Pacific stopped for supplies at the Hawaiian Islands, and observations made there, that might serve for guidance or warning of mariners, are sometimes to be found in the logs of vessels spoken on the Northwest Coast.

Some obscure points of Hawaiian history have already been clarified by means of such entries, and more information will no doubt be obtained as other ships' logs are brought to light.

All the accompanying chapters except the first were suggested

by reading the journals available. The first chapter was subsequently added as introductory.

Grateful acknowledgment is made to Mr. Bruce Cartwright, Professor R. S. Kuykendall, Bishop H. B. Restarick, Mr. W. F. Wilson and others for the loan of references and notes, and for constructive criticism of the first MS.

#### MODERN AND ANCIENT IMPORTANCE OF HONOLULU

The Honolulu of today, Hawaii's political and commercial capital, housing about one-third of the Territory's population, appears to have been founded entirely upon foreign trade drawn to it by the foreigner's discovery that it had a harbor suitable for foreign shipping.

Prior to such time, apparently, it was of no special importance to the natives. It is not mentioned as the residence of any king or high chief (nor at all for that matter) in their traditions—namely those accounts accepted by Fornander as of historical value. Such neglect is significant of its relative lack of importance in the period covered by the traditions because the same accounts record the establishment of the capital of Oahu at Waikiki by King Mailikukahi (26, II, 89)—about 1500 A. D.—where it was generally maintained until moved to Honolulu early in the nineteenth century. By "capital" of course is understood the seat of the government, namely the principal residence of the reigning king, who was the government and about whom native life revolved.

On the other hand, the localization of myth incident within the boundaries of Honolulu *ahupuaa* might indicate its early settlement. When the leads are followed it is found that, possibly, a settlement was made by the first of a line of Oahu rulers. In other words, Honolulu may have been an ancient native capital of Oahu which was supplanted by others.

In a geography printed in Hawaiian in 1832 (83, p. 155), Honolulu is said to be an *ahupuaa*, namely a land section extending from the ocean to the mountains, and including the reef, the harbor, village and valleys. The contiguous *ahupuaa* on each side were Kapalama and Waikiki respectively, as today. Kamakau (41; 43) confirms the statement in the geography, and includes Punchbowl and Kewalo within the *ahupuaa*. Thus the greater Honolulu of

the time included Makiki, Pauoa, Nuuanu and Waolani valleys. In this paper, the name Honolulu in its limited application will refer to the village, and the harbor and *ahupuaa* will be especially designated when referred to. In the geography and by Kamakau it is stated that the former name for the harbor was Kou, while other writers apply the name Kou to the village. These points will be discussed in their place.

The choice of Waikiki as a native capital or royal residence, in preference to Honolulu, might appear most natural from the native point of view in conjunction with the known type of Hawaiian canoe. At Waikiki, were found better surfing, greater proximity to the ocean for deep sea fishing, inland pools suitable for fishponds, a smooth, sandy plain for houses, and many channels through the reef leading to sandy shores, so convenient for beaching canoes. The shallow water within the reef at Waikiki is quite deep enough for the Hawaiian canoe.

The former shores of Honolulu harbor may be visualized today by examining those of Kalihi—an alternation of raised coral reef and mud flat, together with some sand beach when reached by the waves. For canoe landings, the harbor was limited, according to testimony on land matters given by Levi Chamberlain in the first half of the nineteenth century (84). He stated that Premier Kinau had refused a trading house a lease on a property (vicinity of present piers 11 and 12), because, among other reasons, "it was the only place where the natives could bring in their canoes." Probably it was the site now marked by the ruined boat landing adjoining pier 12.

Chamberlain's statement, applied to Honolulu harbor as now known, appears incredible, but it may be explained by means of the Blonde survey made in 1825. The map (52) illustrates two important things. (1) The deep water touches the shore only at one place, namely, the vicinity of piers 11 to 13. (2) Between this channel and the rest of the shore were broad reef flats, more or less dry at low tide. The range of tide is about two feet, and the draft of canoes from half a foot to two feet.<sup>1</sup> Canoe movement

<sup>1</sup> In 1798, Townsend (75, p. 23) observed canoes being built with hulls six feet in depth. If paddled, the draft of such canoes would be not less than 4 to 4½ feet. They were probably some of the *peleleu* fleet, built especially for the conquest of Kauai, and were not regarded as typical.

therefore was much restricted within what is now the harbor, especially for the larger canoes used by the chiefs. For the commoners, however, these reef flats were a blessing, providing them at low tide with many pickings of marine food.

As the residence of commoners, or the back-country of the capital, the early *ahupuaa* of Honolulu fits the picture of the traditions. The cultivation of its valleys was coextensive with that in the valleys of the neighboring *ahupuaa*, but it falls behind in the number and importance of sites of temples and fish-ponds, namely, structures built upon order of or under the supervision of the great chiefs.

Approaching the myth period, it might appear that Honolulu had not been neglected by royalty. Malo (53, p. 323) records that Luanuu, the son of Laka (Polynesian, Ruanuku, the son of Rata) died in Honolulu and was buried in Nuuanu, while his great-grandson, Pau, son of Hua, was born in Kewalo. The dates would be about 1100 A. D. if calculated by the genealogy.<sup>2</sup> Unfortunately, this note by Malo must be accepted with reserve. It is part of a list of fourteen genealogical personages whose birth, death and burial places are given with great exactness, while practically no such details have been preserved concerning their descendents in the thirty generations which follow. They may be localizations of legend only. The list includes the names of such well-known Polynesian characters as Aikanaka (Kaitangata), Hema, Kahai (Tahaki), Wahieloa and Laka (Rata), who perhaps were never in the Hawaiian Islands. Fornander (26, II, 24) noted a legend that Hua, son of Pau "was an Oahu chief who ruled in Honolulu and Waikiki, and was born in Kewalo." He discredited the account, on the basis that this Hua was accepted as a king of Maui and belonged only to the Maui and Hawaii genealogy.

A semi-mythical character, Kahano-a-Newa, is localized in Waolani valley (82, p. 19). He is said to have introduced the Menehune people from Kahiki, and to have established them as laborers at Kailua in Koolau and at Pauoa and Puuowaina in Honolulu land (26, II, 23). The Menehune were the commoners in Tahiti, and the term was probably replaced by *makaainana* in Ha-

<sup>2</sup> Fornander offers evidence of antiquity of occupation which, if correct, would extend the time to many thousands of years. It is discussed in the next chapter.

waii. The miraculous incidents (mentioned below) in the account give it a legendary character, but if they be regarded merely as embellishments, the account may well be a record of immigration overlaid by traditions of later arrivals. If so, the genealogical position assigned to Kahano would set the date as about 1100 A. D. This is based on Fornander's recognition of Kahano as a son of Newalani, and therefore an uncle of a voyaging Oahu chief named Paumakua.

Many legends localize incidents within the boundaries of the *ahupuaa*. In these accounts, Kou generally displaces the name Honolulu for the harbor or the village, while the valleys of the *ahupuaa* are referred to by their present names.

The legendary character of the accounts (all of modern record) may be recognized by the particular theme: The present city was the scene of the fish-god's activities, of the banqueting hall of anthropophagous spirits, of the meeting place of ghosts, of ghost dances and an eruption of Punchbowl, of the dragon canoe incident, and other mystic situations (82; 27, IV, 478). It is mentioned, incidentally, in the well-known legends of Pikoikaalala (27, IV, 452), Puniakaia (27, V, 161) and Hiiaka (33).

Localized in the valleys are some origin myths. In Nuuanu, *wauke* (plant for tapa-making) originated from a human corpse (82, p. 63). The Menehune people mentioned as introduced from Kahiki by Kahano of Waolani, crossed the ocean on his extended arms as on a bridge (82, p. 19). This Kahano also restored the sun, when it was removed from Oahu. He was the caretaker of one of the temples built in Waolani by Wakea (74; 82, p. 19), the legendary first Hawaiian, while the temple itself was the depository of the sacred shell trumpet (later stolen by a god and taken to Waipio, island of Hawaii). Another legend centers about Wakea and his wife, Papa, and a magic breadfruit tree localized lower down the valley (82, p. 28).

The various localizations, together with the references to introductions and other incidents, while of little or no value themselves for historical purposes, might as already intimated, indicate very early settlements in Honolulu. Emphasis must be laid on the fact that the subject is highly speculative, and no conclusion which a discussion of it might suggest should be regarded otherwise.



Wakea and Papa, although locally regarded as the first Hawaiian man and woman, are the Polynesian personifications of the sun and "Mother Earth" respectively (69, p. 21) and it is needless to say that the various temples attributed to Wakea have not been found.

In the legends examined, Wakea (more correctly Akea or Atea) is localized in only two places in the Hawaiian Islands—In the Honolulu and adjacent valleys, and in Waipio valley, island of Hawaii (24, p. 367). Waipio, it will be recalled, was also the later depository of the shell trumpet, which was stolen from Wakea's temple in Waolani valley, in Honolulu *ahupuaa*.

Certain younger sons of the king of Oahu (26, II, 48-49), resident in Kona, Oahu, moved to Waipio and established themselves as rulers. Abandoning the valley (namely, being driven out by a flood), it later became the residence of the son of one of them (26, II, 56), who through intermarriage is recorded as an ancestor of the Hawaii line of kings. The Kona district of Oahu included Honolulu.

These references may be merely three coincidences in legend appearing to indicate an early connection between Waipio, Hawaii and Kona or Honolulu in Oahu; or they may be the connecting links for a reconstruction of the account.

At least the shell trumpet, or what was so designated, was preserved until modern times, because it was in the Hawaiian Government Museum in 1891 (32) and is probably now in the Bishop Museum. The account is that after being stolen by the gods from Waolani temple, it was re-stolen for King Kiha of the recognized line of Hawaii kings residing in Waipio. It had magic qualities of summoning (almost creating!) thousands of soldiers, and was analogous to the scepter of the Hawaii kings, in whose hands it remained.

Stripping the account of the marvellous, it might be reconstructed to show the occupation of Waipio valley, Hawaii, by the young Oahu chiefs who had stolen the royal trumpet of their elder brother. Being "driven from Waipio by a flood" may be metaphoric of the flood of Hawaii warriors driving out the intruders. Omitting minor points of confirmation, the reconstruction of the account leads to certain genealogical characters who obviously were

human and who were the most important of the chiefly immigrants to Oahu.

The grandfather of the young Oahu chiefs referred to was Maweke, whose genealogy Fornander regarded as the most reliable in the islands. Maweke had three sons, Mulielealii, Keaunui and Kalehenui, whose lines of descendents checked with each other, and formed the criterion for checking those of the other island chiefs, according to Fornander. After a study of the legends, the same writer (26, II, 48-9) assumes the possession of the Kona district and sovereignty of Oahu by the eldest, allots the districts of Ewa, Waianae and Waialua to the second, and Koolau to the third. Maweke, himself, Fornander (26, II, 47-9) recognizes as resident in Oahu, and obviously as *the* chief—so indicated by the sons. His principal residence on Oahu is assumed to have been located in Kona, because there were recorded his descendents in the senior line.

Maweke and his sons apparently were immigrants to Oahu. Fornander (26, I, 206) while assuming an early settlement on Oahu by Maweke's remote ancestors, makes this statement:

There are no legends of historical value referring to the long line of chiefs from Nanaulu to and including Maweke . . . out of all the genealogies of different Hawaiian chief families now known and recited, not one falls in upon the main line of . . . Nanaulu . . . above the time of Maweke. . . . From Maweke . . . the bare stems without collateral offshoots run up to Kii, and from him to Wakea (26, I, 197).

Contrasted with this dearth of information, and with almost startling suddenness, Maweke's several sons are found established in various parts of Oahu, and their descendents are providing material for the traditions!

Fornander failed to recognize the cosmogonic features of the genealogies he regarded as human. As already mentioned, Wakea represented the sun-god, but Kii was the Polynesian Adam or "first man." One of his two sons was Nanaulu, whom Fornander implies was a settler on Oahu. The names following in the genealogy may be cosmogonic or compositional, as discussed elsewhere (69, p. 21), and it is not until Maweke and his sons are reached that we may feel sure of meeting with human beings. And being

human, and the first of their line to be localized on Oahu, the conclusion must be that they were immigrants. The period of Maweke would be set at about 1200 A. D.

The preceding discussion has suggested that Maweke was an immigrant, and that his principal residence was in the Kona district of Oahu. If so, it might be further suggested that Honolulu was his place of residence on account of its shipping facilities.

Fornander (26, II, 8) argued for the existence of early vessels of greater size than the known Hawaiian canoe. He quoted (26, II, 8) from Ellis' measurements "not less than 12 feet" for the depth of hull of a southern Polynesian canoe, taken "from the upper edge of the middle to the keel." Were such a canoe ever used for paddling, its draft could not be less than nine or ten feet, and difficulties might be expected in bringing it through the small beach channels, or beaching it like the known Hawaiian canoes.

A legend (26, II, 48) is current that Maweke's son Keaunui, chief of Ewa, "cut a navigable channel" by which Pearl Harbor "was in all subsequent ages rendered accessible to navigation." A channel of fifteen feet depth through the reef off Pearl Harbor entrance existed before the modern dredging began in 1910, but there is no evidence that it was artificial. The legend might imply that Keaunui was the first to enter Pearl Harbor. However, since the modern Hawaiian canoes can cross the reef at many points, the legend may better imply a recollection of a vessel of unusual depth—a type of vessel later abandoned on account of the difficulty of handling it around the reefs and of beaching it for housing, as generally done with canoes.

The cosmogonic portion of Maweke's genealogy clearly connects him with the other Polynesians, found to the south. As an immigrant then, he was voyaging northward, and if Oahu were sighted, he would approach the southern shore. The most conspicuous bay formerly seen from the sea was that embracing Honolulu and Kalihi Harbors, and the Moanalua lagoons. Of the entrances and facilities, those of Honolulu were unquestionably preferable. It may be assumed then that Maweke made his landfall at Honolulu, and on account of his large vessel and depth of the harbor, made it his headquarters. Later generations, adopting types of boats more suitable for the reefs, set up their capitals in spots

which to them were more attractive. The importance of Honolulu, therefore, suffered eclipse until restored by foreign trade through the requirements of voyaging vessels—similarly to the cause of its early native settlement.

As stated above, this outline must be regarded as speculative, and not historical. The grouping of probabilities which may indicate strength from their arrangement, is also open to serious criticism when other possibilities are considered. However, whether or not applied to Maweke, the outline leaves two points unchallenged: (1) To voyagers from the South, the Honolulu-Kalihi-Moanalua Bay would be the most apparent shelter on the south coast of Oahu. (2) Of the reef entrances to this bay, the broader one of Honolulu would be preferred.

#### NO GREAT ANTIQUITY OF SETTLEMENT.

As already indicated, the earliest settlement of Honolulu deducible from the legends or traditions was possibly 1100 A. D., but more probably 1200 A. D. That it had earlier inhabitants cannot be denied, although there is neither proof nor disproof of it either in native history or archaeology.

On alleged geological evidence, Fornander makes some statements which, if correct, would indicate that this part of Oahu was inhabited long before the sea withdrew from the coral reef underlying Honolulu. This might mean occupation as much as 15,000 years ago. His observations, if trustworthy, would be of extreme interest because none other (depending on traditional data as did Fornander) has even introduced the Polynesians into Oceania prior to the Christian era. Fornander's statements in this connection are still being quoted as authoritative, and should be evaluated. Concerning Honolulu, he says (26, II, 164) that:

(1) In 1822, "a human skull and sundry human bones" were "found embedded" in the emerged coral reef bed underlying Honolulu.

(2) In 1858, in Fornander's presence, an ancient wooden artifact and a stone (indicative of a sling-stone) were found below Honolulu harbor "embedded" in "volcanic black sand" under a "pan of coral rock which it was necessary to break up and remove" when dredging.

Fornander's statements in full were submitted to Dr. Palmer, Professor of Geology in the University of Hawaii; to Dr. Stearns, geologist of the U. S. Geological Survey, and to Dr. Edmondson, palaeontologist and marine zoologist of the Bishop Museum, for opinions on the probable accuracy of the accounts, and on the minimum and maximum ages attributable to the deposits on the assumption that the observations were correct. The replies indicate strong disbelief.

For the first reference, Dr. Palmer adds the suggestion that "it must have been an intrusive burial; a practical joke; or a misinterpretation" and that the emergence of the coral bed "is likely to be correlated to a world-wide lowering of sea level dated by R. A. Daly as about 3000 years ago." This would indicate an age of considerably more than 3000 years for the human deposits. Dr. Stearns places the range of age as between 5000 and 15,000 years, and Dr. Edmondson as between 5000 and 10,000. While offered as opinions only, they are sufficiently corroborative to indicate that the allegedly ancient deposits would predate any traditional settlement of Oahu by many thousands of years!

Fornander's first reference was to an observation made in 1822 (but not recorded until 1868) on the finding of human bones in wells being dug through Honolulu's limestone bed. The author, a retired trader and mariner, remarks:

Neither myself, nor any who saw these remains, were naturalists, and the opportunity of describing and preserving these most interesting fossils was neglected . . .

From the facts related *and on reflection*, I am led to the conclusion that the [Hawaiian] Islands were inhabited by man, before and during the formation of that vast body of coral that underlies Honolulu (36a, pp. 2-3).

The portion I have italicized suggests that the author's conclusion was one recently deduced from his recollections of casual observations made 46 years previously. It is not convincing. However, Fornander published only part of the account.

This limestone bed was said to be "full of cavities and channels through which the fresh water ran towards the shore." Digging the first well, situated "three or four hundred feet from the



shore," a bone, thought to be from the human thigh, was reported as found set firmly in the coral rock, and

from one of the cavities before mentioned in the coral bed, the skull of a human being was taken, in *good order and preservation*, but darker than a new skull. It evidently *had some strength* in it as *it was kicked about by boys*. The cavities did not communicate with the surface. [In a second well] The substrata proved to be the same as in the former case, and the coral was full of cavities, from which were taken a number of small bones, which I, with several others, examined and considered to be the bones of a man's hand or foot.

A portion of this quotation is italicized in order to draw attention to the remarkably good state of preservation of a human skull in an obviously damp cavity. It implies a comparatively recent interment. In sand burials, datable through the presence of foreign scissors and buttons as less than 140 years previous to examination, I have found the skulls too decayed to handle. I doubt if the skull found in 1822 had been buried more than 50 years.

Cave and crevice interment was a Hawaiian method of disposing of the dead, and cavities in the emerged coral reefs were frequently used for the purpose on Oahu (20, pp. 115-7). If the bones found during the well excavations were not so placed by human hands, it is probable that they had been lodged in crevices in the existing inland cliff face of the limestone bed, or in other cavities therein, and were subsequently washed through the channels mentioned to the site where found.

Concerning Fornander's second reference—the replies of the scientists consulted were as skeptical of the antiquity of the specimens mentioned as of the bones. Furthermore, so far as may now be ascertained, Fornander's statement lacks the confirmation of those who should have been eye-witnesses.

The occurrence he gives as in the year 1858. Running through the Pacific Commercial Advertiser for the year, it becomes evident that blasting of the reef rock underlying the harbor was then a novelty, and was being tried for the first time. As indicated in the issues for August 12 and September 9, two underwater blasts were tried in one section, and attracted many sightseers. The commotion of the water was very great and, at the second blast, the

onlookers were drenched. Native divers, without modern appliances, reported the underwater results of the blasts.

The newspaper reporter displayed keen interest in the proceedings. Had the implements mentioned been found "embedded" as Fornander stated, it is surprising that the significance of such condition had to wait for recognition until Fornander published his book twenty years later. That Fornander's reference applied to one of the two experimental blasts there can be no question, because none other were mentioned during the year.

Implements found in a depression made in the bottom of the harbor by a powder-blast could readily be carried there by the return rush of the water following the blast, and could even be covered by the accompanying sand and mud.

From another angle, Dr. Stearns points out that the volcanic sand referred to is more recent than the coral reef rock, and that it has been known to creep into cavities beneath the coral. He suggests that the implements may have been moved with the sand, *if* the account were correct. Such a movement might have been comparatively recent.

In brief, in the absence of confirmatory observations, there appears to be no grounds for regarding these references of Fornander's as indicating very ancient human occupation of Honolulu.

#### EARLY NAMES FOR HONOLULU, AND THEIR ORIGIN.

In the literature, the names applied to Honolulu or its harbor are Honolulu (or variants), Kou and Fair Haven (See Table I). Some of the early journals ignore the name of the port, and mention only the island, Oahu.

FAIR HAVEN.—Brown, the foreign discoverer of the harbor, named it Fair Haven—appropriately descriptive considering its natural advantages. Unconsciously, without doubt, the Frenchman, Péron, complimented the place with the name "Fair-Heaven!"

As a name for Honolulu, Fair Haven had a vogue among foreigners only, and that only for few years. It fell into disuse before the end of the eighteenth century.

HONOLULU, AND VARIANTS.—The present form "Honolulu" did not come into official use until 1825 or later, as is indicated by the product of the local printing press. The title-pages of these

publications carried the form "Honoruru" in 1825, and "Honolulu" in 1827 and later (3).

Earlier renderings of the name by voyagers, travelers and residents are listed in Table I. In these the sound of *l* was seldom recognized, but such was not a matter of great importance, because in Polynesian the *l* and *r* represent the same consonant. The list, when analyzed, indicates the presence of several forms of the name. The principal are "Hanaruru" and "Honoruru"—the first being twice as frequent as the second—while another but rarer form, "Honorunu," is definitely recorded.

In view of some of the pronunciations to be heard today, namely "Honnerlooler" or even "Hannahloolah" (English vowel sounds), the variability might be attributed merely to auditory idiosyncrasies of the foreign recorders. Such, of course, must be expected, but this explanation is only partial. While most of the recorders wrote in English (so unadaptable to Polynesian sounds), their records are in the main confirmed by others who wrote in German, French, Russian or Spanish, which phonetically are closer in accord with Hawaiian than is English. Obviously there existed variations in the Hawaiians' pronunciations of the name before it became unified by means of the schools and the printing press. Examples of such variations are still carried in the Hawaiian dictionary.

The variations in the native pronunciation will be better understood when the derivation of the name Honolulu is discussed. For the present, they may be recognized, together with the idiosyncrasies of the foreigners, by means of an analysis of the composition of the forms. These are rearranged in column 3 of Table I, with the vowels carrying Hawaiian values. Examining the files of letters in the column, a remarkable degree of constancy is to be observed in the initial, the third and the sixth letters, namely *H*, *n* and *u*. They may be set down as truly Hawaiian. The constancy of the *u*, indicating the presence of the long or accented vowel, is important to note for later reference.

The next letters in order of frequency are the fifth and seventh, namely *r*, which is used by over twenty authorities, as against *n* being used by two. While we must accept the *r* (or *l* as we prefer) as standard, we cannot reject the *n* as a foreigner's idiosyncrasy be-

TABLE I  
EARLY NAMES FOR HONOLULU

| Date   | As Appearing                           | Hawaiian Vowels                          | Authority  |
|--------|--|--|--|
| 1827   | Honolulu                               | H o n o l u l u                          | Missionary publications (3, p. 26)                   |
| 1825   | Honoruru                               | H o n o r u r u                          | Port regulations (3, p. 19)                          |
| 1825   | { Hanarura<br>Hanaruru }               | { H a n a r u r a<br>H a n a r u r u }   | Bloxam, original MS (10)                             |
| 1825   | Hanaruro                               | H a n a r u r o                          | Kotzebue (47)  |
| 1823-4 | { Honoruro<br>Honolulu }               | { H o n o r u r o<br>H o n o l u l o }   | Marin's letters (55)                                 |
| 1823   | { Hannarurah<br>Honoruru }             | { H a n a r u r a<br>H o n o r u r u }   | L. Chamberlain (18)                                  |
| 1822   | Hanaroora                              | H a n a r u r a                          | Bill of lading, ship America.                        |
| 1822   | Hannah-roorah                          | H a n a r u r a                          | Mathison (57)  |
| 1822   | Honoruru                               | H o n o r u r u                          | Ellis (24, p. 11)                                    |
| 1822   | Honoruru                               | H o n o r u r u                          | Tyerman and Bennet (78)                              |
| 1820-2 | Hanaroorah                             | H a n a r u r a                          | Missionary journal (3, pp. 10-11)                    |
| 1820   | { Hanaroona<br>Hanarooro }             | { H a n a r u n a<br>H a n a r u r u }   | Mrs. Loomis (50)                                     |
| 1819   | Onoroureu                              | O n o r u r u                            | { Freycinet (28, p. 545);<br>Gaudichaud (28, p. 105) |
| 1819   | Anourourou                             | A n u r u r u                            | Arago (2)  |
| 1818   | { Honoruru<br>Honoruro }               | { H o n o r u r u<br>H o n o r u r o }   | Golovnin (29, pp. 313, 372)                          |
| 1817   | Hanarura                               | H a n a r u r a                          | Hunnewell (36)                                       |
| 1817   | { Honorora<br>Honororoa }              | { H o n o r o r a<br>H o n o r o r o a } | Corney (20, pp. 71, 90)                              |
| 1816   | { Honorura<br>Honoruru }               | { H o n o r u r a<br>H o n o r u r u }   | Adams (1)  |
| 1816   | Hana-rura                              | H a n a r u r a                          | Kotzebue (46, II, 33)                                |
| 1816   | Hanna-ruru                             | H a n a r u r u                          | Chamisso (46, III, 46)                               |
| 1816   | Hanarourou                             | H a n a r u r u                          | Choris (19)  |
| 1814   | Hanarooro                              | H a n a r u r u                          | Log of Behring or Atahualpa (35, p. 74)              |
| 1813   | Anaora                                 | A n a u r a                              | Log of Atahualpa (35, p. 71)                         |
| 1812   | Hona-roora                             | H o n a r u r a                          | Cox (21)   |
| 1811   | Ourourah                               | U r u r a                                | Ross (68)  |
| 1809   | Hanaroora                              | H a n a r u r a                          | Campbell (15)  |
| 1806   | Anahooroo Bay                          | A n a h u r u                            | Mariner (56)   |
| 1796   | Fair-Heaven                            |  | Peron (65)   |
| 1796   | { Fair Haven<br>Honununo<br>Honununu } | { H o n u n u n o<br>H o n u n u n u }   | { Greatheed (30)                                     |
| 1796   | Fair Haven                             |  | Broughton (14, p. 39)                                |
| 1795   | Fairhaven                              |  | Boit (13)  |
| 1793   | Honoonoono                             | H o n u n u n o                          | Vancouver (80, III, 363)                             |
| 1792-3 | Fair Haven                             |  | References to Brown                                  |
| 1750?  | Hononunu                               | H o n o n u n u                          | Kualii chant, by Kamakau (43)                        |
| ?      | Kou?                                   |  | ? Legendary or poetic.                               |

cause Kamakau (43) writing in 1868, also recorded the name "Hononunu" for "Honolulu" in his chant of Kualii. The *n* in "Hononunu" must, therefore, be accepted as a variation under native authority.

The second letter is given as *a* by sixteen authorities and as *o* by ten. The greater frequency of the *a*, confirmed by usage in other parts of Polynesia (see pp. 55-6 below) would imply that it was the correct form in Hawaii. However, the Polynesian scholar, Ellis, wrote *o* in the name in 1822, so we must allow both the *a* and the *o* as native variations prior to 1825. The fourth letter is generally *a* or *o* in agreement with the second, but in a few instances it is *u*. This latter may be due to the pull towards *u* of the third syllable, or to metathesis of the second and fourth syllables as in "Honununo." It should undoubtedly agree with the respective vowels of the first syllable, namely *a* or *o*.

The least constant letter is the ultimate, which is represented by *u* or *a* in about equal number and, although rarely, by *o*. The last mentioned may be recognized generally as a shortened form of the *u*. The presence of *a* may perhaps be explained as Caucasian carelessness regarding the terminal vowel; today, "Honolula" is the most frequent error in spelling the name. The Polynesian linguists, Mariner and Ellis, and the scientists Chamisso and Gaudichaud wrote *u* for the last letter, as did the Hawaiians when they came to write their own language, so we may accept the final *u* in the name as correct.

The analysis indicates that before the Hawaiian orthography was determined upon (about 1825), three forms of the name Honolulu had been in use, namely, Hanaruru (or Hanalulu), Honoruru (or Honolulu) and Hononunu. Nevertheless, there appears to be no reason to attribute other than the one meaning to the various forms.

The name Honolulu means "sheltered bay" according to Hawaiian interpreters today (31; 44), and inferentially is derived from such appropriate description of its harbor. In preference to others which have been advanced, I accept this view on the broad basis of Polynesian comparisons.

*Hōno*, the first half of the compound, according to Mr. Hart (interpreter of Archives of Hawaii), carries the nuclear concept of



"concavity." One of the definitions of the term in the Hawaiian dictionary is "a cave or bay; a sheltered spot in the sea; a sheltered place." It is important to note that *hono* in this sense is limited to Hawaii, and absent from the other Polynesian dialects surveyed in Tregear's extensive work (76). But common to many of them is another term, *hono* in Hawaii, Tahiti, Mangareva, and New Zealand, and *fono* in Samoa, indicating "splice, join, assemble, etc."

On the other hand, seeking the term for "bay" in the various dialects, we will find it as *hana* and *haka* in the Marquesas, *'anga* in Rapa, *fanga* in Samoa, *hanga* in Easter Island and *whanga* in New Zealand. In Tonga, *fanga* indicates "a landing place." These terms are all written *hana* in Hawaiian, which accords with the greater frequency of the form in the name Hanaruru before the language was reduced to writing. "Hanaruru" or "Hanalulu" therefore is good Polynesian, while "Honoruru" or "Honolulu" is not. Apparently the Hawaiians were in process of changing the older Polynesian term *hana* to *hono*.

A similar Hawaiian change from the *a* to the *o*, apparently, was taking place in the causative, which in the various Polynesian dialects above mentioned, was *ha'a*, *fa'a*, *whaka*, etc. The Hawaiians alone have the two forms, *ha'a* and *ho'o*, of which *ho'o* is much the more common and Tregear (76, p. 606) was of the opinion that it was the later.

The change in the Hawaiian Islands from *hana* to *hono* indicating "bay" is also suggested by a survey of the place-names. In the maps published by the Survey office of the Territory of Hawaii, it will be found that practically all the place names beginning with *hāna* (not *hanai* or *hanau*) or with *hono* front on coastal bays and are frequently applied to bays or landings. Summarizing those carried on the maps, we obtain the following figures:

|                   | Total<br>No. | Kauai <sup>3</sup> | Oahu | Molokai | Maui | Hawaii <sup>3</sup> |
|-------------------|--------------|--------------------|------|---------|------|---------------------|
| <i>hana</i> ----- | 12           | 42%                | 17%  | 0%      | 33%  | 8%                  |
| <i>hono</i> ----- | 31           | 3%                 | 6%   | 6%      | 36%  | 48%                 |

<sup>3</sup> The 8% for Hawaii in the upper line represents but one name, Hanamalo, given as that of the cape bordering Okoe Bay in South Kona. It may not belong to the list. The 3% for Kauai in the second line also represents one name, Honopu, which does not show a well defined bay on the map. As a term, *honopu* indicates "a mob," and *hono-* in this name may mean "assembly, etc." cf. Samoan *fono*.

The distribution indicates a former wide-spread use in the Hawaiian Islands of the term *hāna* for "bay" in place names, and its preservation on Kauai. It is significant also that on Kauai was long preserved the Polynesian *t* against the inroads of the misapplied Hawaiian *k*. The use of the term *hono* for "bay" apparently originated on the island of Hawaii, and spread through the group displacing the older term *hāna*, which became lost except in place names. Evidently the change was not completed until foreign teachers adopted the pronunciation of the windward islands, and recorded it for that of the Hawaiian group.

The outline suggested will seem even more reasonable, when it is recalled that the associations of the former Oahu chiefs were mostly with Kauai, and that they were conquered and decimated by the Maui chiefs, who in turn were eliminated on Oahu by those of Hawaii.

The second half of the name is determined by the analysis and current Hawaiian pronunciation to be *rūru* or *lūlu*, with a varietal form *nūnu*. In Hawaiian *lūlu* is defined as "calm, still; without motion as of wind or water; protected from the wind; sheltered, protected as with cover or cloak." The term is opposed to *lulū*, meaning "to shake."

It would be difficult to differentiate *nunu* from *lulu* in this connection. In Hawaiian, the *l* and *n* are frequently interchanged, and many pairs of identities may be noted in Andrews' dictionary, among which are: *lunu* and *nunu*, *nalo* and *nano*, *nalū* and *nanu*, *nolu* and *nonu*. The interchange of *l* or *r* with *n* is paralleled in Maori, where *lūlu* is represented by *ruru* with similar significance to the Hawaiian. For instance, the idea of "shelter or protection" carried in the Hawaiian term is preserved in the Maori *ngungu* in *whaka-ngungu*, "to ward or parry." (76, p. 286). The Maori *ng* and *r* become *n* and *l* respectively in modern Hawaiian. We may thus leave *nūnu* in Hononunu as a varietal pronunciation of *lūlu*.

Another term, *nūnū*, "the trumpet fish" (*Aulostomus valentini*) may be suggested in this connection, thus offering "Trumpet-fish harbor" or "Shoal of trumpet-fish" as an interpretation. However, the pronunciation of the fish name differs from that in the place name. Furthermore, in the many collections of fishes made since 1819 and listed by the U. S. Fish Commission (79) no

trumpet-fish were taken in the harbor. Obviously there is no identity of the fish name with the place name.

Honolulu harbor is, and was, perhaps better sheltered than any other bay in the Hawaiian Islands—from the regular winds in one direction, and from the ocean waves in the other. The unusual combination may well have suggested to the early natives a name equivalent to “sheltered bay,” or to “Fair Haven,” as was applied by the first known foreigner to visit it.

This suggested origin is compatible with Polynesian comparisons, with a review of Hawaiian philological changes and place names, with ancient Hawaiian custom in place-naming, and with the understanding of modern Hawaiians as to the meaning of the name. It is offered as the rational explanation. At the same time there is no native account, legendary or traditional, which so asserts it.

On the other hand, many explanations of the origin of the name have been published or are currently related as native tradition.

Westervelt (82, p. 14) rejects the idea of “Fair Haven” formerly applied to Honolulu, and interprets *hono* as “abundance” and *lulu* as “calm,” meaning that the name referred to a land section having “abundant calm” or “a pleasant slope of restful land.” He continues:

Honolulu was probably a name given to a very rich district of farm land near what is now known as the junction of Liliha and School Streets, because its chief was Honolulu, one of the high chiefs at the time of Kakuhihewa, according to the legends.

Unfortunately he does not mention his authority, but his remarks read more like a suggestion than a statement. I have been unable to obtain any confirmation of them.

About a quarter mile to the south-west of this pont, and in the yard (belonging to Mr. A. Quadass) at the southern corner of Liliha and Vineyard Streets, is a large piece of compact basalt named by its owner “Honolulu,” and said to be that from which Honolulu took its name. According to the legend, it was the site of a chief’s residence, whither the people brought their taxes.<sup>4</sup>

About 250 feet to the north of this stone in the site of another, still larger, which was the original Honolulu stone, according to

<sup>4</sup> See p. 99 for another account since collected.

Mr. John Hiram (a resident of fifty years standing). It was destroyed about a decade ago to make way for a concrete ditch.

As arbiter for such conflicting statements, Dr. George H. Huddy was sought. He was born on or near the first lot before the present streets were cut through. He had heard the legend relating to the "Honolulu tax stone," but thought the stone in sight was too small. Subsequently discussing the matter with Mr. Hiram, Dr. Huddy favored the second site. He finally suggested that the site should be indicated with no greater exactness than "the vicinity of Liliha and Vineyard Streets intersection."

Mr. Bruce Cartwright has heard references to a stone named Honolulu on lands north of the intersection of Liliha and School Streets. This is either the spot mentioned by Westervelt, or in the neighborhood of it.

Half a mile north-west of the last, in Wailuakio spring, is yet another stone named Honolulu according to information supplied at the desk of the Archives of Hawaii, and attributed to the late Stephen Mahaulu, formerly a resident of the vicinity, and a well-known Hawaiian interpreter. I have been unable to secure confirmation of this statement, either by a visit to Wailuakio, or from former residents of the locality. A question as to the authenticity of the story arises when it is found that Wailuakio is in the *ahupuaa* of Kapalama, and not in Honolulu.

Listed here are at least five sites after which Honolulu supposedly was named. All are within an area of half a square mile, and near the north-west boundary of the land-section of Honolulu. They cannot all be authentic; probably none is. They remind me of the tendency towards, or craving for the mysterious to be observed among our modern Hawaiian residents, either of native or foreign blood, and among our visitors. I have observed the growth of many myths—born of a casual remark or a misunderstanding—and believe that Hawaii could well be named "the land of the neo-myth."<sup>5</sup>

In this connection, I draw attention to an adulatory song, entitled by its first line, and now almost forgotten. According to two authorities, it opens thus:

---

<sup>5</sup> Cf. note, p. 99.

|                            |                          |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Aia i Honolulu kuu pohaku; | In Honolulu is my stone; |
| O Kealohilani kuu haku ia; | Kealohilani is my lord;  |

The song continues with a description of forests and references to places on the island of Hawaii, of which the Honolulu mentioned is a land section. It does not refer to Honolulu, Oahu (64). Few people of today know the song, but many know the title only and think it refers to the Liliha Street stone which, allegedly, gave Honolulu its name.

With the growth of neo-myth in mind, I venture to suggest that the misunderstanding of the song-title created the need to localize it in some stone, which materialized through continued repetition of surmise! Possibly other "Honolulu stones" will yet be found.

The song itself is modern, having been composed either for or by Princess Ruth, who was born about 1826. Kealohilani was the intimate or alternate name of Princess Ruth, according to the authority (81) claiming the song as in adulation of her. The other authority (45) attributed the name Kealohilani to the king, brother of Princess Ruth, who was said to have been the composer.

Possibly there was no actual stone originally, because the term *pohaku*, "rock or stone" might be merely metaphoric of the *haku* "master" mentioned in the line which followed.

KOU.—Kou is mentioned today by some Hawaiians and others as the ancient name for Honolulu harbor, or the village, or for both. Westervelt is specific:

What is now known as Honolulu was until the time of Kamehameha I, about the year 1800, almost always mentioned as Kou, after the chief, Kou, who was an *ilamuku* (marshal) under King Kakuhihewa. Kou appears to have been a small district, or, rather, a chief's group of houses and grounds, loosely defined as lying between Hotel Street and the sea and between Nuuanu Avenue and Alakea Street. *Ke-kai-o-Mamala* was the name of the surf which came in the outer entrance of the harbor of Kou (82, p. 15).

There are many conflicting angles bearing on this subject. The references to Kou in numerous legendary accounts (see p. 44 above) might well serve to establish the name as ancient, except that the few facts in hand inferentially deny it, or its existence.

Also in confirmation, is the direct statement, in the geography



(83, p. 155) printed in Hawaiian in 1832 by the missionaries, that Honolulu was an *ahupuaa*, and the name of its harbor was Kou. This is the earliest published reference to Kou so far available to me. The statement was repeated in 1865 by Kamakau, who unquestionably was taught from the native geography mentioned. Another native writer (33) stated in 1862 that Kou was the ancient name for Honolulu.

On the other hand, prior to 1832, the name was not Kou so far as the list in Table I indicates. Specifically, the earliest name recorded was equivalent to "Honolulu," and was applied by the natives to the harbor in 1793 (80, III, 363), and both to the village and the harbor in 1796 (30).

Still more significant, the name Kou in this connection is not known to the land attorneys and title searchers (44; 51; 61; 73), nor does it appear in the testimony presented during the great land division about the middle of the nineteenth century nor in the indexes of awards (49). Its absence, where large and small plats of land were designated by name and not by surveys, would appear to be conclusive of its non-existence as an accepted place name for Honolulu.

These variances may be reconciled by regarding Kou as either an alternate or a poetic name for Honolulu harbor or village. Several Hawaiians (31; 44; 81) have heard references to *kou* trees growing formerly in Honolulu and along its shores. Such is to be expected because the *kou* is more or less littoral in its habits. Ulu-kou, "kou grove," is a place name still preserved at Waikiki, and where there was a large grove of *kou* trees until 1860-1870. On the basis of this analogy, Kou might have been applied to Honolulu on certain occasions.

For instance, assuming the naming of the harbor as descriptive of its natural advantages, and the extension of the name to the land section, the later discovery of the smaller harbor of Kewalo within the *ahupuaa* of Honolulu might have necessitated the employment of an alternate name for Honolulu harbor. The name Kou might thus have come into use.

However, since the name Kou is found only in myths and legends, I favor the idea that it was only a poetic name in reference to its *kou* trees. The name apparently has been kept alive by

the saying (39) "Hui na maka i Kou," (literally, "The eyes meet at Kou," but said to mean "We shall meet again at Kou.") It is a not uncommon parting among the older people. This Kou is supposed to refer to Honolulu. But the line occurs at the close of the chant of Mamala as she bids a final farewell to her former shark-husband (82, p. 54). Furthermore, in usage, the reference is always understood to be indefinite and almost indifferent, and means at most, "We shall meet again *sometime*" (81). In such a parting, Honolulu is not specifically intended.

In any case, the matter of relative antiquity of name would seem to favor Honolulu as being found applied to the whole *ahupuaa*, of which Kou at best was a very small part.

#### DISCOVERY OF HONOLULU HARBOR BY FOREIGNERS

For over a century the name of William Brown, commander of the ship Butterworth, stood unchallenged in print as that of the discoverer of Honolulu harbor. In 1922, Cartwright (17) pointed out, on the evidence of the date accepted, i.e. 1794, that the discoverer could not have been Brown. Cartwright further suggested that the credit be assigned to officers of Portlock's ships in 1786. In 1923, Kuykendall (48, p. 20) accepted the new conclusions. Also in 1923 a statement (16) was published that the discoverer was John Kendrick, commander of the sloop Lady Washington.

Other information, since brought to light, would tend to confirm Brown as the discoverer, and establish the date as 1793 or before.

Brown<sup>6</sup> was commodore of a squadron of three vessels, the ship Butterworth, commanded by himself; the sloop Jackall, commanded by Stewart, and the sloop Prince Lee Boo, commanded first by Sharp and later by Gordon. They called at the Hawaiian Islands while engaged in the fur-trade of the northwest coast of America. Brown's earlier visits were in the Butterworth, and after dispatching that ship out of the Pacific, he transferred to the Jackall. Stewart, retiring, later settled in the Hawaiian Islands. On Brown's last visit, November 21, 1794, he was in Honolulu harbor with the Jackall and Prince Lee Boo, engaged in altering the rig of his vessels when the king of Oahu besought his military aid

<sup>6</sup> For notes on Brown, his captains and his vessels, see pp. 96-98.

in defense against the invading King of Kauai. Through the assistance of Brown's men, the invader was killed early in December, and the Oahu king became firmly established. •

This king, while maintaining an appearance of the greatest friendliness, boarded and captured both vessels on January 1, 1795, and killed Brown and Gordon, his associate captain. The vessels were afterwards recaptured by the survivors under the mates George Lamport and William Bonnallack, who sailed to Hawaii island and left a letter in the hands of John Young and Isaac Davis, telling of the disaster, and serving as a warning to other navigators. This letter, dated on Hawaii, January 14, 1795, has the following passage:

... the "Jackall," commanded by William Brown of London, Mariner, and the "Prince Lee Boo," commander by Robert Gordon of London, Mariner, entered the harbor of Fair Haven [Honolulu] in the island of Woahoo, discovered and named by the said William Brown in the year 1794, then commander of the ship "Butterworth" of London . . . (11, p. 93).

This is the earliest intimation of Brown's discovery found so far. The letter was observed in Young's possession in 1825 by Bloxam, who copied it, but it was not published in Hawaii until 1925. Young seems to have been the means of disseminating its information to subsequent arrivals in Hawaii, because in the eighteenth century, while the news was still fresh, Young is either quoted by those discussing the harbor or he is found in their company.

Broughton was anchored off the harbor from February 11 to 14, 1796, while he surveyed it with his boats. He notes:

The harbour, though of small extent, is safe and convenient, with five fathoms sandy bottom . . .

It was discovered by a Mr. Brown commander of the merchant ship Butterworth, in 1794 (14, pp. 39-40).

The informant was obviously John Young whom apparently Broughton had carried to Oahu on that trip (cf. 14, pp. 33, 69). Broughton's comment at this point illustrates what little was known of the harbor on his visit four years previously:

It is singular we had not discovered the harbour of Fair Haven, when we anchored here in 1792, in the Chatham with the Discovery, Captain Vancouver. We did not indeed search

for one, though I remember a break was noticed in the reef as we sailed through Whytete bay (14, p. 44).

Rev. S. Greatheed, one of the founders and directors of the London Missionary Society, gathered much material concerning the Hawaiian Islands of this period. The last event he described occurred at the end of 1796, and was communicated to him by Captain Barber, who had been greatly assisted by Young and had learned from him of the cession of Oahu to Brown. The following from what is known as "The Greatheed MS" may, therefore, wholly or in part, be attributed to Young:

... Capt. Brown, in the Jackall, accompanied by Capt. Gordon, in the Lee Boo, anchored in the reef harbor of Honununu, (which had been discovered and named by Capt. B., Fair Haven) Nov. 21, 1794 ... and was so incautious ... as to land his rigging and stores(30).

Greatheed, unfortunately, neglected to mention the ship Butterworth—an omission which has helped to confuse some of the missionary historical writers who followed him.

In 1843 Jarves published a history of the Hawaiian Islands from information gathered there and in Boston, and from the published voyages including Broughton's. He observes:

This [war] occurred in 1794. Brown was master of the English ship Butterworth. The same year he discovered and surveyed the harbor of Honolulu, which he called Fairhaven. It was first entered by the schooner Jackall, tender to that ship. On the first of January, of the ensuing year, 1795, Brown was in this harbor with two vessels, the Jackall and Prince Lee Boo; the Butterworth had sailed for England (38, p. 179).

All these points but two might have been gathered from the Greatheed MS. and Broughton's voyage. The exceptions, namely, the survey and first entry by the Jackall, are of special interest as pointing to the existence of source material at present unknown but authoritative nevertheless. The fact of the survey of the harbor by Brown, or his subordinate Stewart, is inferentially confirmed in the MS. journals of Boit (1795) and Townsend (1798). Townsend, when on Hawaii, met Stewart, who accompanied him to Oahu and was mentioned several times in the journal:



Stewart has been master of a vessel and is a man of considerable intelligence; had been here four years (75, p. 63).

I found the Island of Whahoo a delightful one. The harbor is a good one but rather narrow to get in. The ships lay in the bay as it is generally difficult to get into the harbor but by warping. I have a draft of this harbor which I have copied from one in the possession of Capt. Stewart (75, p. 67).

Boit identifies this Stewart as one of Brown's captains, formerly in command of the Jackall:

Young informed me that among the rest of the Englishmen, that where residents at this Island, was a Capt. Stewart, who had formerly been master of the Sloop Jackall, but in consequence of a misunderstanding with Capt. Brown, chose to be left, at these Islands . . . (13).

Apparently when Brown discovered the harbor he was accompanied by Stewart in the sloop Jackall, tender to the ship Butterworth, then regarded as large for a trader. The smaller vessel, as customary in channel exploration, entered the harbor first.

Thus far, all the accounts accredit any discovery to Brown, and in general to Brown in the Butterworth, but specifically not to Brown in any other vessel. The accounts written prior to 1800 appear to have been drawn from Young's information. Jarves, however, had other information which was confirmatory.

The accounts by the local missionaries omit reference to the Butterworth, and mention only the Jackall and Prince Lee Boo. In this, they seem to have followed Greatheed. Another source of their information was the native Hawaiian, which is frequently incorrect. For instance (22, p. 28), Vancouver is said to have arrived after "Palaunu," i. e. Brown, while Palaunu arrived after "Alika," i. e. Aleck, no doubt referring to Capt. Alexander Stewart of the Jackall, who later settled on Hawaii island. The near association of Alika and Palaunu is correct enough, but they arrived *after* Vancouver's first visit, and not before.

The earliest local publication to mention the harbor was the geography written in Hawaiian by the missionaries Whitney and Richards, and printed in 1832. They merely state that "Brown's two vessels" were the first to enter the harbor (83, p. 156).

Dibble, who states he drew much of the information for his



history from native sources, sets the date 1793 for the following account, rather fully quoted for later reference:

At this time there were three vessels in the port of Honolulu, the first that ever entered that harbor. Two of these, a ship called the Jackall and a tender called the Prince le Boo, were English vessels engaged in the trade of the north-west coast. Prince le Boo was the first vessel of any nation that entered Honolulu harbor. Captain Brown spent a considerable time at Honolulu repairing and remodeling one of his vessels, and became quite familiar with the chiefs and people. The other vessel was an American sloop of ninety tons, which sailed from Boston in company with the Columbia in 1787, called the Lady Washington, and commanded by John Kendrick, the first vessel, it is said, that engaged in the trade of carrying sandal wood from the Sandwich Islands to China (22, p. 54).

Dibble's reference to the tender Prince Lee Boo being the first to enter the harbor may have been due to a native statement that the smaller vessel entered first. Dibble apparently had not heard of the Butterworth. The date, 1793, which he used, might have been correct for the discovery of the harbor, but should have been 1794 for the time the Jackall, Prince Lee Boo and Lady Washington were there together.

Kamakau (42), writing in Hawaiian in 1867, follows Dibble and adds that the ships belonged to the American government (!), and were engaged in "discovering islands" and resembled men-of-war. The last reference is a reminder that the Butterworth was said to have formerly been a frigate of 30 guns (cf. p. 98), and that the Jackall was given a formidable appearance, with many false gun-ports.<sup>7</sup> The second point may have been suggested by the survey made of the harbor.

But one reference of importance remains. Bingham, who had earlier contact with the natives than did Dibble, has this note:

Kalanikupule and his party being victorious, maintained the appearance of friendliness towards Brown, to whom they had pointed out the entrance through the coral reef into the harbor of Honolulu, not known before to the civilized world (8, p. 45).

Bingham mentions his authorities:

The accounts of this transaction [murder of Brown] given by the English, from Mr. Lamport's MS., by Mr. Jarves, and by

<sup>7</sup> See notes on p. 98.

Mr. Dibble, are all widely different from each other . . . (8, p. 47).

Jarves' and Dibble's accounts are available. By Lamport's MS., Bingham may have referred to the letter left with Young and Davis, or to the Greatheed MS., both of which may have been available to Bingham in the Hawaiian Islands. He may also have referred to another paper entirely. It is important to note, however, that Bingham states that it was through the natives' help that Brown found the harbor.

The other accounts published in the nineteenth century are obviously based on some of those given above, and need not be repeated. Thus, so far as I have been able to ascertain, all the accounts published in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries assign to Brown the discovery of the harbor, in which all the available unpublished accounts, but one, agree.

The exception is found in a letter concerning the identity of an American, John Young, not the John Young of the *Eleanora* generally referred to. It was written in 1856 (though not published until 1923) by David L. Gregg, the U. S. Commissioner to Hawaii. In this is found the following paragraph irrelevant to the subject of the letter :

In a memorandum or Journal kept by John Young of the *Eleanor*, the Brig *Washington*, John Kendrick master, is mentioned as the first vessel that entered the harbor of Honolulu. She was engaged in the war then prevailing among the chiefs, & the Capt. was accidentally killed by a wad from one of the guns of his ship while going ashore (16, p. 52).

It is very difficult to understand this statement attributed to John Young of the *Eleanora*, who, as indicated above, was the principal means of recording Brown as the first to enter the harbor. Gregg has certainly confused the accounts, probably because of references to "firsts." If we turn back to the quotation from Dibble (p. 65 above), it will be observed that Brown's was the "first vessel" to enter the harbor, and Kendrick's the "first vessel" to engage in the sandal-wood trade. Gregg's account may be rejected with safety.

The place examined or surveyed by the officers of Portlock's two ships in 1786 was clearly not Honolulu harbor, as suggested by

Cartwright (17), but the small bay at Waikiki off Ulukou, the ancient royal residence, the site of which is partly occupied by the Moana Hotel. Portlock was probably told of Honolulu, but the accounts indicate that his men did not reach it.

Portlock was then anchored in Waialae Bay with "a heavy swell setting into the bay round Point Dick [Koko head] which caused the ship to roll very much" and was told that in the next bay "was an exceedingly snug harbor, where the ships might lie in safety." (66, p. 158). A boat from each ship was sent round Diamond Head to survey the spot, and the officers made the following reports:

Mr. Hayward . . . reported, that there was no convenient anchorage in any part of the bay; and that there was from sixty-six to seventy fathoms water close in shore. We now learned that Teereteere [the king] generally resided in the bay, which is called by the natives Whitette [Waikiki] Bay (23).

He had found a small bay with very deep water, close to a sandy beach, where the natives generally landed their canoes, but no place for a ship to ride in with safety; adjoining to the beach, in a beautiful valley, surrounded by a fine grove of cocoa-nut trees and a delightful country, there was a large town, where (as Towanooha informed him) the king generally resided, and the district round it was called Whyteetee [Waikiki] (66, p. 164).

The misapprehension that the spot visited by Portlock's officers was Honolulu is immediately removed by the reports themselves. For instance: (1) The district of Waikiki, so identified by the natives, was distinct from that of Honolulu (83, p. 155) and extended no further westward than Kewalo (p. 41 above). (2) The large town observed by the officers at Waikiki, and said by the natives to be generally the residence of the king, could be none other than the capital Waikiki, mentioned traditionally (p. 41 above) as the royal residence, and so observed by voyagers subsequent to Portlock. (3) The depth of water "sixty-six to seventy fathoms close in shore," cannot apply to Honolulu harbor where Broughton, ten years later, found only five fathoms. (4) Similarly, "the deep water close to a sandy beach, where the natives generally landed their canoes, but no place for a ship to ride in with safety," contrasts too strongly with Honolulu harbor, which had

only limited accommodations for canoes (p. 42 above), but was always reported safe for ships.

The cause of the misapprehension was no doubt the described proximity of deep water to the beach. Of course the statement was only relative. Portlock's ships, then in Waialae Bay, were anchored about two miles off the shore, which was fringed by extensive tidal reef flats. At Waikiki the outer edge of the reef is only about half a mile from the beach, which is conveniently reached by canoes or row-boats through many channels.

From the reviews of the preceding, there appears no reason to doubt that Brown's ships were the first to enter Honolulu harbor. Furthermore, the indications are that at the time, the Butterworth (with Brown on board) and the Jackall were in company.

DATE OF DISCOVERY: No question on the point of discovery would have been raised were it not for the date assigned to it, namely, 1794. According to Menzies, who accompanied Vancouver, the existence of the harbor was known to some traders as early as 1792:

We . . . being informed while on the north-west Coast of America [i. e. in 1792] by the masters of some of the trading vessels that a small snug harbor was situated on this side of the bay (59, p. 126).

Furthermore, it has not been generally known that Brown's vessels were at the Hawaiian Islands prior to 1793. Obviously, if the existence of the harbor were known in 1792, and Brown did not see it until 1794, or even 1793, he was not the discoverer.

Adding to the confusion is the fact that the published account of Vancouver's voyage gives no indication that he saw Brown or any of his captains in 1792, although both the Jackall and the Butterworth were anchored in the same harbor with Vancouver and at the same time the Spanish commanders (4; 67) stated that the Butterworth brought despatches for him. Vancouver, however, did record seeing other ships.

When the published account of Vancouver's voyage is read in connection with the journals of his officers, Menzies, Manby and Bell, many omissions of importance may be noted. They will be discussed in the later chapters. Nevertheless, if the published account be read carefully, clear indications will be found that Brown

had surveyed Honolulu harbor prior to July, 1793, and that he probably knew about it in 1792.

Observing the southern shores of Oahu in 1792, Vancouver thought he saw two possible harbors (80, I, 371) and was probably the first of the navigators to note them. In March, 1793, after Menzies and others had heard of the "small, snug harbor" which obviously was Honolulu, Vancouver went under the pilotage of the high-chief Kamohomoho to find it. He was conducted to the western opening, shown by name ("O-poo-ro-ah"=Puuloa) and description to be Pearl Harbor. It was found suitable for shipping in every way except for the prohibitive bar outside the entrance (80, III, 361-3). Vancouver continues:

The other opening to the eastward, called by the natives Honoonono, Tomohomoho represented as being very much more shallow, and a smaller place; this induced me to pass it without examination;

He then adds an important passage:

but to show how liable we are to be mistaken in such enquiries among the natives, I was afterwards informed by Mr. Brown of the Butterworth that although it is smaller, and of less depth of water, yet it admits of a passage from the sea five fathoms deep between the reefs; and opens beyond them into a small but commodious bason with regular soundings from seven to three fathoms, clear and good bottom, where a few vessels may ride with the greatest safety; but the only means of getting in or out is by warping.

Vancouver's reference here to "Mr. Brown of the *Butterworth*" is illuminating, because the published account mentions only one meeting of Vancouver with *Brown on that ship* after March, 1793. This was in July, the same year, when Vancouver (80, IV, 112 ff) acknowledges valuable assistance from Brown in the exploratory surveys of the northwest coast of America. Subsequently, after Brown had transferred to the Jackall, there were many meetings, but with consistent reference to "Mr. Brown of the Jackall" (80, VI, 33, 55, etc.).

Through this differentiation and reference to the description by Brown, it becomes apparent that he had surveyed Honolulu harbor prior to July, 1793.



The theme of Vancouver's journal entry in July, compared with his subsidiary remarks of March, quoted above, adds further confirmation:

I have ever found it extremely hard, almost impossible, indeed, to make the inhabitants of these remote parts, and even the Sandwich islanders, with whose language we are much better acquainted, comprehend the kind of passage that is required for ships to pass through, or the kind of port or opening in the land that is capable of affording them safe and convenient shelter (80, IV, 118-9).

Obviously, both journal entries were made at the same time. Vancouver had just been misled by native information into difficulties of coastal navigation from which he had been rescued by Brown.

To return to Oahu: This island and Kauai had been ceded to Brown (see next chapter) about a month before Vancouver reached it. Brown's survey of the harbor may then be placed as early as February, 1793. It may have been in 1792. It is to be inferred that since Vancouver failed to find the harbor of which his officers had learned on the Northwest Coast, and then went to Brown for the correct information, it must have been Brown who gave them the intimation of its existence.

But for Brown, probably, Vancouver himself would have entered Honolulu in March, 1793. His opinion of the piloting skill of native peoples, however deeply felt, did perhaps unduly belittle the abilities of the Hawaiians of his day. Through their extensive line and other fishing and their diving, the Hawaiians were well acquainted with the sea bottom near the shore. They also knew the drafts of Vancouver's vessels because they had been employed to examine and report on their under-water condition. As for Kamohomoho, Vancouver's pilot on Oahu, he had also been his pilot on Maui, and, to Vancouver's surprise and pleasure, had conducted the vessels along the coast at night to a very suitable anchorage (80, III, 293-4). Kamohomoho was also acquainted with the suitable anchorages on Molokai (80, III, 339). Kamohomoho was not without understanding. It might be mentioned that he was the younger brother and general of the king, and was generally successful in his battles until foreign arms controlled the situation. He is also accepted as the one who later contrived and suc-

cessfully carried out the killing of Brown and the capture of his vessels.<sup>8</sup>

If Kamohomoho conducted Vancouver past Honolulu (as being too shallow) to Pearl Harbor with its almost prohibitive bar, it is obvious that Vancouver was being purposely deceived. The Butterworth, a larger vessel than Vancouver's flag-ship, had undoubtedly already entered Honolulu Harbor. The deception may have been under Brown's orders, directed against other traders. They could not have been intended against Vancouver. But in 1793, from the native view-point, Brown was an ally from whom firearms could be obtained. No doubt he was also regarded as a potential protector against aggression from Hawaii. Soon after his departure, Vancouver appeared as the avenger of the Hergest and Gooch murders (80, III, 291), and, ignoring the fact that from the native viewpoint they should have been politely forgotten (59, p. 111), insisted on trials and executions.<sup>9</sup> He refused the natives firearms, and urged the leeward island kings to make peace with his friend and their relentless archenemy Kamehameha, whom they could not trust (80, III, 305, 319). Vancouver was tolerated on Oahu that year (80, III, 297) because his ship was powerful, but Brown was the one who then received the consideration of the natives. Kamohomoho carried a letter of recommendation from Brown (80, III, 293) and is noted as meeting the ships. There can be not the slightest doubt that Vancouver was purposely misled.

The identity of Menzies' (and undoubtedly Vancouver's) informants, on the Northwest Coast in 1792, of the existence of Honolulu harbor may be accepted as Brown and his captains, because Vancouver, misled by the native pilot, is found to be quoting Brown as the authority. In 1792, Vancouver met many traders on the Northwest Coast, but most of their accounts are now available, and give no hint of a knowledge of Honolulu harbor. However, in one of the journals are entries which indicate that both Brown and Stewart had been at the Hawaiian Islands in 1792.

<sup>8</sup> See footnote following.

<sup>9</sup> Vancouver's demands must have been embarrassing, if Kamakau is to be believed. The murders were carried out on general orders of the king, who was delighted with the booty secured. Kamohomoho protected the murderers and, in their stead, executed in Vancouver's presence men already condemned for other offenses. He then continued calmly to pilot Vancouver along the coast!

before they met with Vancouver's ships on the American coast. Ingraham (37, Aug. 1, 1792) learned that Stewart had been in the islands subsequent to the murder of Hergest and Gooch on Oahu on May 11, 1792, and prior to his meeting with Ingraham at Queen Charlotte Islands on July 17 of that year. On August 8, Ingraham observes that Brown had "Sandwich Islanders" on board the Butterworth. Brown and Stewart, therefore, must have been in the islands in May or June. Since they left England in 1792 (cf. 9), the month was probably June. Are we then to set the date of the harbor discovery as in June, 1792? And if so, what about the previously accepted date, 1794, given on the authority of Lamport and Bonallack, the mates of Brown's ships?

The date 1794 was obviously an error. It apparently was not taken from the log, or the day and the month would have been set down. Such an error is not surprising considering the extraordinary experiences the mates had recently been undergoing. So far as they may be traced, it will be observed that the authorities using the year 1794 received their information through John Young, who in turn depended upon the mates' letter, except in the following instance.

Boit (13) stated that he was informed by Young, that Brown entered Honolulu Harbor in *February*, 1794. This, of course, is incorrect, because Brown was then in China in command of the Jackall (80, V, 354-5). However, the reference to the month is interesting, because Brown and Stewart were in the islands in the Butterworth and Jackall in February, the previous year, when Brown acquired the island of Oahu.

An acceptable outline is that Brown either discovered but did not survey the harbor in June, 1792, or, that he learned of its existence from the Hawaiians he had on board. The information was communicated by Stewart or Brown to Vancouver's people in Friendly Cove at Nootka, who were there from Aug. 28 to Oct. 13, 1792. During this time Brown was in the same harbor for three days (7, pp. 33-4) and Stewart for about four weeks (60, pp. 122, 126, 129). The survey had not then been made, otherwise Vancouver, having the information, would not have been misled by Kamohomoho. It was assumably made in February, 1793, when Brown, who had large plans for settlements or trading stations,

had looked over the field on the Northwest Coast and in the Hawaiian Islands. Brown apparently made a full report of his proceedings to Vancouver in July, 1793, when next they met.

#### THE *Haole* PROPRIETOR OF OAHU.

Closely allied to the preceding theme is the cession to Brown of what has been described as "the whole right and property of the islands Oahu and Kauai." Most of the information relates to Oahu, the cession of which has been ignored or discredited by local historians. The latest contribution is: "The problem presented by the alleged surrender of the island to Brown is well-nigh insoluble" (48, p. 14).

References coming later to hand, and closer analyses from the native angle indicate that the cession was real, but that it was viewed in different ways: (1) Brown and resident Europeans understood he had obtained title to Oahu, (2) Native evidence admits the purchase, but in native custom permanence of title was vested only in the king.

The references also imply that Brown left London with instructions or plans to establish a station in the Hawaiian Islands, and that in the cession Vancouver collaborated with him.

The subject will be approached first from the Hawaiian side. When Cook arrived at Maui and Hawaii in 1778-9, the Hawaii forces possessed part of Maui and were then pushing their encroachments. Following Cook's departure, Kahekili, king of Maui, crushed the Hawaii forces by superior strategy, drove them from Maui and captured many of the foreign iron daggers they had obtained (72, p. 27). Hawaii being temporarily inert, Kahekili turned his attention to Oahu and conquered that island. His younger brother, Kaeo, had, through marriage, become king of Kauai. Consequently Kahekili dominated or exercised a powerful influence on all the islands except the largest—Hawaii. He was at the height of his power in 1786 when Portlock arrived.

Meanwhile, the king of Hawaii island had died, and in the ensuing civil war, Kamehameha was fighting for its control. His first victory hinged on one fortunate stroke, and he made no real progress until he secured firearms and foreigners to use them. His success thereafter was marked, not only on his own island, but on

Maui, which he raided. When Kahekili, with his brother, the Kauai king, undertook a return invasion of Hawaii, he was totally defeated by Kamehameha in the first naval battle in which cannon was used by the natives. The destruction by these weapons caused the natives to name the engagement "The red-mouthed cannon."

In February, 1793, Brown found on Maui the two recently defeated kings and their armies, awaiting with apparent trepidation the return attack for which Kamehameha was preparing with his foreign-built vessel and his cannon. In view of the native fear of and regard for the foreigners' weapons, Bell's entry of March 13, 1793 may not seem unreasonable:

Mr. Brown, in the Butterworth, who had left this Isld. [Maui] only a fortnight before we arrived had given them a number of Muskets, a very large quantity of Powder, and two pieces of Cannon (4 pounders)—for these last Titeeree [Kahekili] had given him the whole right and property of the Islands Woahoo and Atooi [Oahu and Kauai], entitling him to take off them, at his own will everything he stood in need of, and this strange as it may appear we afterwards found to be true . . . (6).

Beil then becomes cynical of the native sincerity, being unaware that at that moment, no price would be considered by the Maui king as too high for cannon:

but these people have a great deal of Cunning, they know that the Ships will only touch at their Islands about a couple of months in a year, and for the same price or less they would sell the Islands over again to every ship that stops among them.

Bell's information, it should be noted, was from native sources (apparently from King Kahekili himself). There is a certain element of truth in his surmises on their ideas, which from the native point of view might appear entirely proper. Neither Brown nor the local kings saw matters through the same eyes. The basis of native thought in such matters was "change"—that of Brown, "permanence."

The foreigners' ideas of the cession will be considered later. For the present, we may attempt to arrive at the native point of view.

From this angle, it is probable that the grant to Brown was analogous to the native royal grant to a feudal chief. In theory



it was temporary and revocable at the royal will, at the death of the grantee or the death of the king (71, p. 13). In practice, were the feudal chief or his family too powerful to be dispossessed, renewals of the grant were to be anticipated for diplomatic reasons. In return for such grants, military service was expected as a matter of course. Brown was undoubtedly called on for such services, as shall be mentioned presently.

The alienation of native title, which the foreigners described, was probably not intended by Kahekili. When his opponent, Kamehameha, finally yielded to Vancouver's solicitations in 1793 and 1794 for a cession of Hawaii island to Great Britain, it was with full reservations as to existing native authority:

These were the prominent features in the several speeches made on the occasion: in every one of which the religion, government and domestic economy were noticed; and it was clearly understood, that no interference was to take place in either; that Tamaahmaah, the chiefs and priests, were to continue as usual to officiate with the same authority as before in their respective stations, and that no alterations in these particulars was in any degree thought of or intended (80, V, 94).

This, as stated, was in 1794 after Vancouver had spent two seasons in explaining his idea of a cession. Although the natives confirmed the cession by shouting that they were "kanaka no Pele-kane" (men of Britain), it is very doubtful if Kamehameha regarded it as, in effect, more than an alliance for his protection against foreign aggression,<sup>10</sup> and a means of employing British arms and vessels in his planned conquest of the Hawaiian group. While Vancouver had consistently refused Kamehameha firearms, he aided him in building one vessel, and promised him a ship from the British government—a promise fulfilled much later.

In 1793 the urge for island conquest, and for foreign arms and ships for the purpose, together with foreigners to handle them, was dominant among the Hawaii chiefs, whose attempts to entrap Vancouver in some military commitment were obvious.

Kamehameha's peace terms for Kahekili and his brother, ac-

<sup>10</sup> In 1824, thirty years after the cession, Boki, the spokesman in England for the late Kamehameha II, personally addressed George IV: "We have come to confirm the words which Kamehameha I gave in Charge to Vancouver, thus, 'Go back and tell King George to watch over me and my whole Kingdom. I acknowledge him as my Landlord and myself as Tenant (for him as superior and I as inferior). Should the foreigners of any other Nation come to take possession of my lands, then let him help me!'" (60a)

according to Vancouver (80, III, 263) were that Kahekili should yield up his hereditary kingdom of Maui, and the neighboring islands of Molokai, etc. and retire with his brother to Oahu and Kauai. Since Kamehameha then possessed only the island of Hawaii, his "compromise" was merely an intimation of his intentions.

These intentions were clearly enough expressed by Vancouver after this peace offer was made, as extending to conquest of all the islands:

The king and several of the chiefs solicited my assistance in the conquest they meditated of all the islands to leeward. They entertained great hopes of my concurrence from the friendship I had uniformly manifested, and from the utter abhorrence I had uniformly expressed of the cruel and horrid murder of our countrymen at Woahoo, belonging to the Dædalus . . . (80, III, 265-6).

So much for the intentions of the Hawaii chiefs towards Kahekili. A cession of their own island would, apparently, enable them to accomplish their desires for conquest of the others. This quotation from Vancouver belongs to an interview with Kamehameha and his chiefs regarding a cession of Hawaii island urged by Vancouver in March, 1793. Vancouver is silent regarding the cession, but it is recorded by Menzies and Manby.

Menzies (59, p. 93) states that the cession was refused unless Vancouver would agree to leave behind one of his vessels in defense of Kamehameha against his enemies.

Surprising as it may seem, the enemies referred to were not foreign—such as Kamehameha might alone fear at that time—but the Maui warriors. Manby notes:

Capt. Vancouver proposed to the king that he should make over the Islands to him in the name of King George the Third. A long debate ensued which terminated by Tomaha Maha's assenting to the proposal provided Capt. V. would leave a Vessel for its protection or a force with guns.

The Chief argued the point with great reason pointing out the imprudence of our accepting the Island without guarding it; as during our absence their inveterate Enemy Tietenec [Kahekili] the King of Mowee would make his threatened invasion, perhaps with success, as could it be expected the Owhyeeans would fight with firmness for their Country, if they had imprudently given it away to those who would not

protect it? Their considerate reply totally put a stop to any further proposals(54).

Kamehameha's diplomatic guile is obvious in this sophistry, because the king of Maui was clearly on the defensive, and no invasion of Hawaii was to be feared while Kamehameha had his foreign-armed fleet. The "defense forces" stipulated are explained in the speech by Keeaumoku, when the cession actually did take place next year. This chief, the father-in-law of Kamehameha, was mainly instrumental in setting him on the throne, and therefore spoke with some authority. Keeaumoku stated that:

on their becoming connected and attached to so powerful a nation [Great Britain], they ought no longer to suffer the indignities which had been offered this island [Hawaii] by the people of Mowee . . . that she ought to be chastised, and that when a force for their protection should be obtained from England, the first object of its employment ought to be the conquest of Mowee . . . (80, V, 92.)

These closing lines, referring to the force for protection (which of course included the promised vessel) are more illuminative of the native idea of the cession. As shown by Kamehameha's stipulations at the cession, the king of Hawaii would remain king under any circumstances; but now it appears that the British king, in a way, would become his vassal! Such is obvious, because the British forces solicited for Kamehameha's protection could be employed first for extending his conquests, according to the native point of view.

Prior to any of the interviews mentioned, it had been explained to Vancouver (80, III, 241) that the earlier attempts of the Hawaii natives to capture foreigners' vessels were prompted by their plans for island conquest. Briefly then, it may be assumed that to the native king, a cession of the island of Hawaii meant the yielding of a vague and unreal semblance of title, in return for which he secured foreign arms and vessels for his conquest of the other islands and in the meantime retained undiminished, his full authority and prestige.

Kahekili's ideas regarding a cession probably differed little from those of the Hawaii chiefs. There was this difference of course—Kahekili was then on the defensive, and could he have controlled

Brown, in all probability he would have again invaded Hawaii. It is to be noted that the Maui natives did make this attempt in Brown's vessels when captured two years later.

The Butterworth; formerly a 30-gun frigate, was the largest vessel of her time in Hawaiian waters. In addition, Brown had two other vessels at his command. Thus, an implied alliance with Brown, or obligation for military service, would be very comforting to the Maui king with the foreign-armed and aggressive Kamehameha just across the channel. That Brown might have used his forces in defense of Kahekili against Kamehameha is not improbable, but his participation in an invasion of Hawaii is unthinkable in view of his obvious arrangement with Vancouver (see next chapter).

Apparently Brown was called upon twice for military service, in addition to furnishing arms. A rebellion on Kauai had resulted in killing Kahekili's messengers, and Brown was, according to Vancouver (80, V, 126) "solicited" by Kahekili to carry him to Kauai in order to control it. The king settled the rebellion merely through an interview on the Butterworth, and reinstated the chief rebel in authority according to the account. The orthodox method was to capture, kill and sacrifice the rebel. Apparently Kahekili secured the submission of the rebel through the show of force in Brown's vessel.

Later, Kahekili's heir on Oahu "requested" Brown's assistance against the Kauai invaders of Oahu. Brown first of all furnished arms, and, later, men (30).

Briefly, from the native point of view, it may be assumed that Brown had become a feudal lord under the Hawaiian system.

Contrasted with the native view, Brown and his people undoubtedly had the idea of permanence of cession—an idea also shared by John Young and Isaac Davis, who when expressing it had already been in contact with the natives for five years. Their first informants may have been Brown, himself, or Stewart, who later resided with them, or the surviving mates of Brown's vessels; and through the subsequent conquest of Maui and Oahu by Kamehameha, they had opportunities for conversing with natives of those islands.

Following Bell's notice of the cessions early in 1793, quoted

above, the next reference, subsequent to Brown's death, is by Bishop in the MS. log of the Ruby under date of Sept. 16, 1795. The information, entered on the Northwest Coast, was attributed to Isaac Davis as a communication to the captain and supercargo of the Mercury, which had lately left the island of Hawaii. The journal states that Brown, for the purpose of meeting his consort

sailed last autumn [1794] to the Sandwich Islands to Procure Provisions and Pass the Winter months both vessels in Company with a Captain Kendrick in a large sloop belonging to Boston.

When Captain Brown wintered at these Islands before, coming to Woahoo [Oahu] an Island adjacent to Owhyhee the Principal one of the Group, he found a strong Factions Party in opposition to the reigning Chief and having himself received some affront from the King, he landed 18 or 20 of his People and joined the opposing Party, who took the Island and killed the King, they then Putt on the throne the Son of their former chief, who did Homage to Brown and subjected himself and Subjects to His Will and Pleasure. The Island itself became Brown's and his People took hogs or anything they wanted, not one daring to oppose them.

These vessels arriving there last autumn, the King came off and did Homage to Brown as before . . . (9).

Making allowances for the growth of exaggeration, due to repetition and possibly to this happy dream of a trading captain, it should be noted that Isaac Davis, resident five years in the islands, apparently understood that Oahu had been ceded without reservations, that the cession was one or more winters prior to 1794, and that Brown defeated the enemies of the king's son, and then set him on the throne.

On October 16, 1795, Boit (13) made the following entry in his journal as coming from John Young:

in February, 1794, Brown anchor'd in Fairhaven harbour, Isle of Whoahoo with two Sloops, the largest command'd by himself & the other by a Capt. Gordon, & that he proceeded to alter one Vessel into a Ship, & the other into a Cutter for to make them handier for cruising the N. W. Coast in which trade he meant to embark, that while he was there employ'd the Cheifs of Whoahoo made him a formal present of the Island with all its contents, of which he accordingly took pos-



session & that on the 3rd of Dec's Capt. John Kendrick in his Snow Lady Washington of Boston arriv'd at Fairhaven, & met with a very friendly reception by Capt. Brown . . . (13).

Young had just spent several hours with Boit, and gave him enough information to fill eighteen pages of his Journal. The cession, as already noted, was in February, 1793, while the year 1794 belongs to Kendrick's arrival. The entry shows that Young, with similar native experience to that of Davis, confirms the cession of Oahu.

In Greateed's account below (written about 1798), John Young is again authority for the statement that Oahu was ceded to Brown, who is noted as anchoring in the harbor on November 21, 1794:

Taetere [Kahekili—in error for his son Kalanikupule] immediately acquainted him [Brown] that the island was invaded apparently by the former revolvers of Attowae [Kauai], and requested his assistance to repel them. Capt. B., as was common, furnished him with arms and ammunition, and was so incautious, in these circumstances, as to land his rigging and stores. The enemy advancing within five miles of the harbor, and threatening if they prevailed, to attack the ships, Capt. B. consulted his people, and Mr. Lamport, mate of the Jackall, with eight others, agreed to join Taetere's forces, to repulse the enemy. In the first engagement the natives deserted them, and one of the English was killed, and the rest escaped to the canoes. Several actions afterwards took place, but on the 12th December they obtained a complete victory, with great slaughter, and returned the 13th, after six days absence from the ships.

The chiefs and people of the island behaved with the greatest cordiality till Jan. 1, 1795. Most of the Jackall's crew, and part of the LeeBoo's, were then on shore, killing and salting pork. In the forenoon Capt. Brown sent Mr. Lamport with four sailors likewise to shore, to purchase more salt.

The vessels thus being left nearly defenseless, in a small reef harbor, which could only be entered or quitted by warping, afforded an easy prey, and an irresistible temptation to the ambition of Taetere and his Chiefs. Capt. Barber, who was wrecked at Woahu at the close of this year, understood from John Young, that Capt. Brown had prevailed upon the natives to surrender the Island to him, and to supply him a long time with provisions, with flattering promises, none of which being

fulfilled, the Islanders determined to seize the ships by way of indemnity . . . (30).

The remainder of the account describes the death of the captains and capture of the vessels, their refitting by the crews under threats of death by the natives, their employment by the natives in an attempt to invade Hawaii and their recapture and final departure.

Thus, four contemporary accounts affirm the cession of Oahu to Brown. One of them was noted direct from the natives, a fortnight after the event, and the other three were from Young and Davis, who had every opportunity of checking their accuracy.

A hint of the native view point, however, is contained in Greetheed's reference to flattering but unfulfilled promises as an excuse for the natives' murder of Brown and capture of his vessels. It may be considered in conjunction with the account by Kamakau, written 72 years after the event, and apparently based partly on that of Greetheed:

Koi aku la o Kapena Baraunu ma ia Kalanikupule, e uku aku i ke aupuni o Oahu, i uku no ko laua kokua ana ia ia i ke kaua ana me Kaeo. Hoole aku o Kalanikupule, "Aole pono o ke aupuni ka uku o ko olua kokua ana i ke kaua, no ka mea, ua hooholo mua ia, hookahi lau puaa ka uku, oia hoi he umi kahaha, a i keia wa hoi eha haneri." Ua hoole mai no o Baraunu ma, a koi mai no o ke aupuni no ka uku. A no keia mea, ua ohumu iho na 'lii, e pepehi ia Baranunu ma (42).

I append a translation by Mr. E. H. Hart, interpreter of the Archives of Hawaii, and though it differs from that offered by Kuykendall (48, p. 16), it is confirmed by all other interpreters (40; 44; 45; 62; 81) to whom I have submitted it:

Captain Brown et al. demanded of Kalanikupule, to make the government of Oahu as payment—payment of their having assisted in the war with Kaeo. Kalanikupule refused them, "It is not right that the government be the reward for your help in the war, because, it was first agreed that the reward was one *lau* of pigs, which is ten forties, and is now four hundred." Brown et al. refused this, and still demanded that the government be the reward. And because of this, the chiefs conspired to kill Brown et al.

This is the only reference found so far indicating the payment

of a specific amount to Brown for his services in the war. However, Kamakau's statements, when possible to check them, are frequently found to be inaccurate (Cf. 72, pp. 25-32). It is sufficient therefore to point out on contemporary evidence of Bell, Davis and Young, that Brown's privilege of drawing on Oahu for supplies was unlimited. Kamakau's account, however, is of some value in indicating a recollection by the natives of the cession, and together with that of Greatheed, of some feature of native dissatisfaction over the transaction.

The flattering, unfulfilled promises attributed to Brown were obviously only in the minds of the natives. Brown early in 1793 had "bought" the island from Kahekili. In December, 1794, he had defended Kahekili's son and heir against the victorious invaders, finally defeating the latter on December 12 and thereby removing the new king's rivals. Thus, were secured to King Kalanikupule, Maui and Oahu and neighboring smaller islands, and the basis of a claim on Kauai, the kingdom of the slain invader. Within less than three weeks, namely on January 1, 1795, Brown had been killed, allegedly for not keeping his promises, by the man whose life he had saved, and for whom he had secured not one but two kingdoms. It is difficult to understand what unfulfilled promises might have arisen within three weeks, and which might not have been automatically wiped out by the favor of December 12.

The answer is suggested by the use to which Kalanikupule put the captured ships—namely, the attempted invasion of Hawaii island. Brown's help had given him control, practically, of all the other islands of the group, and the ambition of Hawaiian kings of this period was unlimited.

To revert to native custom, Kahekili's death early in 1794 had automatically cancelled the grants of Oahu and Kauai to Brown (of course, unknown to Brown) unless renewed by Kahekili's successor. His son, Kalanikupule, had apparently renewed that relating to Oahu by calling on Brown for military service in its defense. Brown, no doubt, regarded the call as one for military "aid." Then it is possible that Kalanikupule, seeing the group almost within his grasp, called on Brown for military service against Hawaii island, which Brown, of course, would refuse. Such refusal,

of course, would be rebellion in the eyes of Kalanikupule, and serve as an excuse for his apparently ungrateful deed.

On the other hand, treachery towards a benefactor has many precedents in Hawaiian history, especially when such benefactors are potential rivals. Brown may have been considered in this class. However, I favor the first explanation.

And having killed the rebel or potential enemy, it was customary to add the last indignity of sacrificing his body. Did Brown receive different treatment? Greatheed mentions that when Lamport and his men were brought back to the village

They found Capt. Brown's body stripped and tied by the hands and feet to a pole. The following day Mr. Lamport was sent for by the King, who was on board the Jackall, and being required to fit the vessels for sea, in order to attack Owhihee, he thought it prudent to consent (30).

There can be little doubt that the Oahu chiefs, having found Brown in life most useful in their military operations, made further use of him in death as the sacrifice to induce the god's favor in the projected invasion of Hawaii island, while offering him up as the fruit of the victory already obtained. And so passed the only *haole* proprietor of Oahu.

The connection of Kauai with the story is not quite clear without the aid of Hawaiian references. As already stated, Kaeo acquired the kingdom of Kauai through marriage, but Kahekili is noted as exercising its overlordship, because he granted it to Brown in 1793. The same year Kahekili is noted by Vancouver as supreme on all the islands except Hawaii, and Kaeo is subservient to him (80, III, 305, 312-3). Four years earlier Kahekili did not control Kauai because we find him offering supplies from Maui and Oahu, but not from Kauai (58, p. 348).

Another unusual arrangement was the bequest by Kahekili to Kaeo of the kingdom of Maui in place of his own sons of high degree who were of age and in rank took precedence of Kaeo. There must have been a bargain between Kaeo and Kahekili, so that Kahekili could grant Brown the island of Oahu (belonging to Kahekili by conquest) and the island of Kauai (belonging to Kaeo.) The two kings were then in combination against the dreaded Kamehameha, and Brown's cannon meant much.

The Brown and Kahekili combination crops up again with regard to Kauai towards the end of 1793, when, as previously mentioned, Brown takes Kahekili to Kauai to control a rebellion.

Brown's grant of Kauai expired with the death of Kahekili, unless renewed by Kaeo. A disagreement over the renewal between Brown and Kaeo may have been the "affront to Brown" mentioned by Bishop (9), or the cause of the threat by Kaeo to destroy Brown's ships in the harbor, referred to by Greateed (30). Whatever the cause, the grant of Kauai to Brown, apparently, was not renewed.

In this discussion I have not stopped to differentiate between a cession of an island kingdom and a grant of the island by the king. The natives regarded the king as owner of all land. The cession Vancouver finally secured for his government was the title and land of the island of Hawaii, but Kamehameha, by special stipulation, very skillfully retained control of the administration and disposal of the land.

The cession of Oahu to Brown, according to Young and Davis indicates that of the kingdom or government, which, as stated, includes the land. Bell's account would imply that it was the land and its products only.

The situation as it was left is rather interesting. According to native custom, no matter what Brown's claim might be, it was terminated through his death at the hands or under the orders of Kalanikupule. However, native customs at this time naturally bore no weight among foreign nations supposed to regulate themselves by contract, because no contract held with a native ruler who could annul it at his pleasure. Consequently Brown's purchase of the islands of Oahu and Kauai could have been recognized by the British government and confirmed to him or the company he represented. The existence of the purchase seems unquestioned, and the purchase itself was far more definite than that of land on Vancouver Island, which resulted in Meares receiving his government's support. The details of the purchase would no doubt be found in the logs of the Butterworth and the Jackall, with references in that of the Prince Lee Boo. That the Butterworth returned to England is obvious, because a few years later she is



noted on a southern whaling cruise (25). The Jackall and Prince Lee Boo left Hawaii for Canton (13).

#### REVIEW OF COMMENTS ON "A NORTHWEST TRADER"

Kuykendall has some remarks on Brown in the Hawaiian Islands which call for review:

It is customary for writers to severely criticize the fur traders for their practice of selling firearms and ammunition to the natives, and the greatest opprobrium for this practice has generally been cast on the American traders. Our information now shows that this English trader, Captain Brown, was one of the worst offenders in this regard, so much so that his death not long after at Honolulu takes on the character of a just retribution.<sup>11</sup> The evidence on this point, while not very extensive, is perfectly clear and convincing. Two charges can be brought against Captain Brown; (1) that he sold firearms and ammunition to the natives of the Hawaiian Islands; and (2) that he incited the chiefs to keep up the internecine warfare which was in large measure responsible for the frightful depopulation of the islands during this period . . . (48, pp. 4-5).

I cannot find Kuykendall's references to "Americans" in this connection. His sensitiveness on this subject may have originated from a misunderstanding of the part I have italicized in his quotation from Vancouver:

. . . articles which they were most eager to obtain, and most desirous to possess, namely arms and ammunition; which chiefly composed the merchandise of the *North-West American adventurers* (48, p. 6).

Vancouver's reference here is not to citizens of the United States of America who, at the time of his writing, were limited to the original group of thirteen states bordering on the Atlantic. It was to traders on the northwest coast of America, and the trading vessels Vancouver had already observed were British, American, Portuguese and French.

Kuykendall's first charge against Brown, namely selling arms to natives, has never been denied nor regarded by contemporaries in any way unusual (cf. 30), except by British navy officers, who

<sup>11</sup> This theme and denunciation of early British navigators is not uncommon in local historical works (22, p. 36; 38, p. 173; 70).

condemned the practice. Such officers were supplied generously by the chiefs, and returned generous gifts. The traders were told by the natives that no supplies would be furnished, except for firearms. Consequently neither American nor British trader should be denounced for the traffic in arms.

Kuykendall (48, pp. 5-6) also quotes Beil and Menzies to the effect that Brown had supplied Kamehameha with muskets, Menzies adding

That they were so very bad that some of them burst on the first firing, on which account . . . were now afraid to fire any of them off.

Vancouver's contribution, continued from his quotation above:

. . . adventurers. Muskets and pistols were thus exchanged that burst on being discharged the first time, though with the proper loading. To augment the quantity of gunpowder which was sold, it was mixed with an equal, if not a larger, proportion of pounded sea [coal] or charcoal.

Vancouver's denunciation might appear contradictory, because it is difficult to see how such adulterated power, "with the proper loading" could burst the guns.

That accidents happened is to be expected. Natives, ignorant of their danger, have been notoriously careless with powder and unfamiliar substances, and an overcharge has been the rule rather than the exception. Neither Vancouver nor Menzies intimate that they tested out "with the proper loading" any of the firearms they condemned. The denunciation so far as presented, was based only on the native statement and the evidence of one painful accident. I have found native generalizations from a single incident so common, that another leaves me somewhat cynical.

This leads us to Kuykendall's second charge, namely the alleged incitation of the native chiefs to war with each other. His proof is a native statement, as quoted by Vancouver, to the effect that traders for "some time past" at Maui had advised continuance of war with Hawaii, and had pointed to the anticipated advantages and sold arms for the purpose. Kuykendall's conclusion is:

In view of the inclusive character of this statement and the fact that Captain Brown had been at Maui but a fortnight before, it

is clear that he was one of the "several commanders" who had been giving them this vicious counsel (48, p. 8).

Again we have a generalized statement, attributed to the natives, and on which a denunciation is founded. The statement is said to have been made to Vancouver who contrasts it with his own assumably altruistic attempts to induce the Maui chiefs to make peace with Kamehameha. They were very suspicious of Vancouver. The question is decidedly an open one, both as to incitation by "commanders" of vessels and to Brown. Had the accusation been made of the runaway sailors resident with the chiefs, it could be accepted as correct because such is of record.

Another point might be mentioned, just for clarification of view. If Brown, or any other captain, British or American, did advise continuance of the war, it should be noted that there was no mention of "aggression" against Hawaii. Kahekili had been beaten to a stand-still by Kamehameha, whose star was rising, and who had the ambition, forces and aggressiveness to crush him. Kahekili had two options—yielding his hereditary kingdom without a struggle, or trying to defend it. As Vancouver shows, Kamehameha's peace terms to Kahekili were that Maui, Molokai and neighboring islands should be joined to Hawaii. If a trading captain advised Kahekili to fight for his hereditary kingdom against a relentless invader, he would seldom be denounced.

#### PLANS FOR HAWAIIAN ANNEXATIONS.

Some speculation may be permitted regarding Brown's instructions or plans, and the official or unofficial support which his government or Vancouver may have afforded him in them. Howay's chapter "Early Commercial Relations and Political Dreams" (34, p. 33), together with obvious omissions from the published version of Vancouver's journal and the absence of Brown's log, leads us to enquire into the effect such dreams may have had on the navigators mentioned, or on their principals.

As will become evident, Hawaii was the merest cog in a large wheel which, under the influence of the newly developing fur-trade Cook's explorations had opened up, was turning towards the colonization of the northwest coast of America. The trend of

thought was no doubt well expressed by the reflections of Manby, one of Vancouver's officers, while at Kealakekua Bay early in 1793:

Should Great Britain ever attempt to colonize any part of the North West Coast of America these islands will give them a very ample store of provisions and provided industry is closely pursued a sufficiency of Rum and Sugar might with ease be produced; not only to supply our own settlements, but to carry a large quantity annually to the Chinese market (54).

Manby may have been influenced by Meares' recommendations published in 1790, which will be discussed later.

The British government had consistently refrained from annexing islands in the Pacific as a right consequent on their discovery. Obviously it had no official interest in the Hawaiian Islands other than that of benevolence and the helping hand it always extended to native peoples. But this government has always given its traders moral support, as well as protection of their rights when necessary. With the East India Company in mind, it is quite probable that had Brown and his principals carried out the great plans discussed, the cessions of the islands would have been accepted by Great Britain.

The plans appear to have been a monopoly of the Northwest fur-trade. The transactions in Hawaii, therefore, have little significance if isolated and will be better understood after the situation on the Northwest Coast is examined.

Brown and Vancouver were in the Pacific following the diplomatic settling of the Nootka Controversy, which had almost resulted in war between Great Britain and Spain. Vancouver came to take official possession of the area in dispute; Brown, assumably, to take prompt advantage for his company of the trading possibilities British occupation might give it.

The Nootka Controversy had arisen through the seizure by a Spanish naval officer at Nootka Sound of British ships trading under the direction of John Meares, together with the prohibition of any British ships from trading in those waters. While war plans were proceeding, fuel was added to the flames by Meares' arrival in London with a highly colored account of the occurrences and the claim that land he had purchased and secured in the name of Great Britain had also been confiscated.

At this time, apparently, the traders regarded the northwest American coast between  $45^{\circ} 30'$  and  $60^{\circ}$  north latitude either as British territory or as "No Man's Land" because Meares, in his memorial to the British Parliament in May, 1790, is found pleading in substantiation of his rights that his captains, when captured, were "confining themselves within the Limits" just given (58, Mem. p. 1). The southern boundary corresponds with the limits for which the South Sea Company granted its licenses, only prohibiting British ships from trading to the south of  $45^{\circ}$  north latitude in this region (54a, p. 296). However, the matter for dispute was even wider. As opposed to Spain's theory of inert ownership asserted merely on the dictum of a Papal Bull, the English attitude was that "unoccupied land anywhere on the globe was the legitimate possession of any nation that would occupy it and develop it" (15a, p. 378).

While force of circumstances, and not of war, prevented British settlements in this region, nevertheless there were plans a-many culminating in that of Brown's company.

In 1785, Portlock and Dixon were instructed by their principals, Etches & Co. of London, trading as the King George's Sound Company, to establish "factories" on the Northwest Coast "for the future securing the trade of the continent and islands adjacent." (33a, pp. 61-2).

Meares, representing English interests domiciled in Asia, spent the winter of 1786-7 on the Northwest Coast, and on his next trip, 1787-8, is found annexing the Straits of Juan de Fuca and erecting a temporary establishment at Nootka where he built a schooner, purchased land and made treaties with the natives to secure exclusive trading privileges with them (58, p. 173, Mem.; 80, VI, 388-9).

In 1789, Meares and his associates combined with Etches & Co. under the name of "Associated Merchants Trading to the North West Coast of America" and despatched from China several vessels under Colnett with instructions, and equipment in personnel and material, to establish a permanent settlement on the coast. It was to be "a solid establishment, and not one to be abandoned at pleasure" (58, Mem. II). Other stations were then to be added. Meanwhile the Spaniards had occupied Nootka, and seized Col-



nett's ships as they arrived—the act leading to British war preparations.

The British Government, as usual, supported its traders with firmness. In March, 1790, Governor Philip of New South Wales was instructed to prepare an armed expedition for the Northwest Coast, assumably to dislodge the Spaniards. "One of its objects" was also to form "such a settlement as may be able to resist any attacks from the natives, and lay the foundation of an establishment for the assistance of [British] subjects, in the prosecution of the fur trade . . ." (28a, pp. 27, 189).

With a Spanish war in prospect, the British Premier Pitt gave ear to the plans of the South American Miranda who dreamed a vast empire in the Americas composed of the possessions he proposed to sever from Spain. British participation was to be east of the Mississippi and, what is of present interest, north of 45° north latitude. Pitt went so far as to sound out the newly formed United States on their sympathies (54a, p. 431). However, no war ensued because Spain conceded the British claims in October, 1790.

In 1791, Vancouver's expedition left England. Brown's squadron joined him on the Northwest Coast in 1792, having left London early that year. The probable cause of the meeting will be discussed.

Meares, responsible for the Nootka Controversy through activities in territory claimed by Spain for her exclusive use, had monopolistic ideas of his own, just as unreasonable. He published in the account of his voyages what might be compared to an experienced promoter's prospectus, urging British monopoly of the Pacific fur-trade and whaling industry "not only in the Northern but in the Southern Oceans." His appeals could reach in many directions. For instance, the government might listen if the anticipated thousands of tons of shipping would serve to train up men as in a "nursery" for the British navy. The merchants and manufacturers were told of the natives' preferences for British wares. For possible colonists, the great agricultural possibilities of Nootka and "the country of New Albion" were favorably described. Potential partners were told of the remarkable prospects in the fur-trade, of purchases and annexations of territory already made, together with treaties with natives for exclusive trade in furs, and

of his organization already established in China, the fur market, and so situated as "shortly to destroy all competition, and give us the exclusive possession of this valuable branch of trade, much to the advantage of our country."

The Hawaiian islands had a place in this empire of trade, as "a station of intermediate repose, where health animates the gales, and every species of refreshment is to be found on its shores." He assumed, on the basis of discovery, that the islands would of course be annexed by Great Britain as an essential "link in that chain of commerce" and enlarged on the advantages of their "situation, climate and produce" and the high quality of the people who were "already ambitious to share the fate enjoyed by British subjects." In his instructions to Colnett, Meares stated: "Some of the natives of those isles, both men and women, may be embarked and transported to America, and made useful in our employ" (58, pp. LXIX-XCV, 10, 210 and Appendix).

Meares and his book, published the year of the excitement, must have had great attention. What influence it had on the government cannot be ascertained. Vancouver was instructed to "examine and survey" the Hawaiian Islands, the Northwest Coast for a possible trans-continental passage to the Atlantic, and the South American coast, south of 44°. In addition, he was to receive from the Spaniards the land Meares had possessed, and to ascertain full particulars of any Europeans' settling on the Northwest coast, and the time when they became established (80, I, 49-68). Of these last two it was mentioned that further instructions might be sent by a later vessel. There is no mention of annexation, but four out of the five instructions come within range of Meares' outline.

Brown undoubtedly had read Meares' book, because it was his practice so to prepare himself for exploratory work (cf. p. 96 below). Either he planned to use Meares' book as a guide, or was so instructed by his principals. It is also possible that the latter were associated with Meares.

Brown's principals may be identified through four references or less: (1) His squadron had been despatched by "A company of London merchants, the principal of which is Alderman Curtis," (7, p. 24). (2) A subscriber to Meares' book was "William Curtis, Esq., Alderman and Member of Parliament." (3) "W. and T.

Curtis, Esqrs." of London are noted in 1799 as the owners of the ship *Butterworth*, whaler (25, p. 261). (4) The William Brown, who was killed in the Hawaiian Islands and his ship *Butterworth* were whalers in 1789 (pp. 96, 98 below).

Etches & Co. had failed in business prior to 1792 (7, p. 41). It is possible that their interest in the "Associated Merchants" was acquired by the Curtis group. Meares being busy in London prodding his government to collect a large money indemnity from Spain, could not well lead the expedition in person.

On the other hand, the head of the Curtis group, apparently being a member of parliament during the turmoil raised by Meares, may have had his business instincts aroused, and being in a position to take advantage of the shipping opportunity, handled the matter among his own associates, after buying Meares' lands.

It is to be noted, however, that Meares received strong government support in his claims for land restoration and for money damages. Similarly according to the statements connected with Brown's expedition, the Curtis company received government support along the lines Meares recommended. And Meares' outline should be kept in mind as Brown is discussed.

Brown is said to have arrived on the Northwest Coast empowered by his government to make settlements and enjoy a monopoly of the fur-trade—of course, when the British took over Nootka from the Spanish. Quadra (67), the Spanish commandant at that station, noted: "Brown was carrying despatches to Vancouver, and had been instructed to found establishments at Queen Charlotte's and two other places on the coast." Ingraham (37, July 17, 1792) learned: "These vessels belong'd to a Company of Merchants who had obtain'd a grant from the British government to make a Settlement or rather to establish a factory on some part of the coast." The matter of shore stations was evidently important, because Brown had already established a sealing station at Staten Land before rounding Cape Horn (9; 80, V, 354).

Regarding the monopoly, Menzies (60, p. 129) notes that Brown's "were the only English Vessels who had an exclusive Grant from Government for Trading on the Coast." The monopolistic idea was so strong, according to Ingraham (ever ready to

discredit his international rivals in trade) that there were rumors of intention to debar the American flag (37, Aug. 8, 1792).

This monopoly of Brown's should have been under license of the South Sea Company which controlled British trading in the Pacific along the American coast and within three hundred leagues of it (33a, p. 2). Such would exclude the Hawaiian Islands. But it is Menzies who mentions the "exclusive Grant from Government." Menzies had previously voyaged to the region in a vessel licensed by the South Sea Company, and must have understood its prerogatives. Furthermore, the South Sea Company, apparently did not grant exclusive privileges to a single company. With Brown's, many British owners' ships were trading on the Northwest Coast at this time, and it was said of one group only that it was "proceeding illegally . . . not having a South Sea pass, this renders them fair and lawful prizes to all Vessels on the Coast properly authorized to trade" (7, p. 34). The South Sea Company may have been moribund; its exclusive privileges were removed in 1807.

Of the other monopolies in the fur-trade, neither the Hudson's Bay Company, nor their great rival the Northwest Fur Company of Montreal (commonly known as the North West Company) reached the Pacific coast until after Brown's company received its privileges. Considering the unusual government support that Brown's company was to receive, *when* Vancouver officially took over Nootka Sound from the Spaniards and a sphere of influence in the fur-bearing region, it is possible that a composition was made with the South Sea Company and a new monopoly granted the Curtis company.

Perhaps the despatches Brown was bringing Vancouver contained government instructions to that effect. As stated above, Vancouver's orders intimated the sending of further instructions by a later vessel. However, when the transport *Daedalus* arrived, Vancouver was disappointed at learning nothing new. Brown had left some months later than the transport.

Vancouver's journal as published is startlingly silent in regard to Brown's arrival or despatches, or even seeing him in 1792, as well as any matters concerning potential British settlement on the Northwest Coast. In contrast, Vancouver has over twenty ref-

erences to Brown or his ships in 1793 and later.<sup>12</sup> He extends unusual courtesies to Brown, expresses great anxiety over his safety, records his ships' movements and details of his voyages, and regards his reports of value, whether on the Russians, the natives or the fur-trade. Brown is noted as assisting Vancouver in the coastal navigation. In the Hawaiian Islands, Brown writes to Vancouver asking the removal of undesirable Caucasians from Oahu and Kauai (Brown's new possessions).

Obviously, Vancouver censored his journal before it reached the printer. If, as seems probable, a new fur-trading monopoly had been granted, it might be supposed that Vancouver was to receive land claimed by Meares in Nootka Sound, the then center of the fur-trade, and hand it over to the representative of the Curtis company. Such company then must have been either Meares' associate or have succeeded to his interests. Vancouver's published instructions were only that he should receive the land. Nothing was said of what he would do with it (80, II, 351-2).

The idea of Meares' influence on Brown's plans seems inescapable. Meares included whaling and other activities in the Southern Ocean. Brown despatched the former whaler Butterworth to the south for whaling and sealing (7, p. 24; 80, V, 354). He had already established a sealing station at Staten Land—part of the region Vancouver was to survey.

As shown in the previous chapter, Meares' recommendations regarding the Hawaiian Islands were already being put into practice by Brown, who is also observed carrying Hawaiians to the Northwest Coast (37, Aug. 8, 1792).

Bell (7, p. 33) noted in 1792 in this region: "the Squadron . . . had been but unsuccessful this, their first season, but they were yet to be on the coast another season from which Mr. Brown expected great things." At this time, Brown had looked over the Hawaiian Islands, shipped some Hawaiians, learned of Honolulu harbor and roughly surveyed the field of the Northwest Coast. He had arrived rather late for the trading season, which was not of moment that year because he was maturing his plans for the future, being then able to evaluate Meares' commercial outline.

<sup>12</sup> Reference 80, III, 198, 293, 363, 428, IV, 112-121, 136, 196, V, 113, 114, 122, 126, 354-5, 357, 405, 411, 413-4, VI, 33, 55, 65, 71, 90-92, 399.



Briefly then, Brown's purchase or securing of islands in the Hawaiian Group, was not the mere accident of opportunity, but the plan of his principals in London. The price paid was the "accident," but then again Meares made his purchases for mere trifles.

The final speculation is the part played by Brown and Vancouver together in Hawaiian annexations. Did they, having both visited the islands in 1792, and while their ships lay together in the harbor of Nootka in October, 1792, plan the annexation of the Hawaiian group?

The singular omission, from Vancouver's published account, of reference to seeing Brown or his vessels in 1792, although in the harbor with Vancouver, has already been discussed. Equally strange are the omissions in 1793, when Brown purchased Oahu and Kauai about the same time that Vancouver endeavored to secure the annexation of Hawaii island—described in the previous chapter. While ignored in Vancouver's publication, they are recorded by his officers (54; 60).

Obviously, an agreement was made between the two at Nootka in 1792 to annex the islands for the furtherance of the new trading monopoly's interests. It was not an official act because when Vancouver finally did obtain the cession of Hawaii island next year, such was not confirmed by the home government.

No combination could have been better under the existing circumstances. Vancouver was soon on terms of intimate friendship with Kamehameha, who controlled the largest island. Brown's friend was Kahekili, Kamehameha's enemy, and in control of the others. Perhaps this is what Townsend (75, p. 74) referred to when he noted in 1798: "Capt. Vancouver had management enough to get all the islands ceded to the king of England."

This interpretation, while a little broad, is important because Townsend was on friendly terms with Stewart who was formerly of the Jackall and who undoubtedly was present at Brown's consultations, both with Vancouver and with the natives. Townsend was also friendly with Young and Davis, who were acquainted with the foreigners mentioned and the natives. Obviously the quotation reveals the plans, but not wholly the accomplishment.

The fur-trade monopoly discussed (if the speculations on its

existence be well founded) appears to have made no further progress. Apparently operation had to await the delivery of Meares' districts in Nootka Sound to Vancouver. Differences of view, regarding the area, caused postponements while Vancouver sought further instructions or definitions from his government. Delivery of Nootka was not made until March, 1795 (54a, p. 471), when Vancouver had already left the Pacific Ocean and Brown was dead. With probable losses due to the death of Brown, the Curtis company may have feared to try again.

The cessions in Hawaii to Brown and Vancouver seem not to have been ratified by their government. The French Revolutionary Wars engrossed the Pitt Ministry in 1793 and later, and may have interfered. But that the annexations were not official acts may be assured, because, had Vancouver been instructed to secure the cessions, it would seem that his official acts would automatically taken the place of ratification, making it unnecessary for his government to act further. It is significant that no further cognizance of the cessions was taken by British government vessels visiting the islands subsequently.

---

#### SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES.

**WILLIAM BROWN OF LONDON, MARINER.** Before entering the Pacific, Brown and his ship Butterworth were Greenland whalers. Brown was a man of unusual ability, and was consulted by a Fellow of the Royal Society with regard to plans for exploring a north-west passage and reaching the North Pole. Subsequently, when urging the project, this Fellow observed that "navigating among the ice being in itself a science, men regularly brought up to the sailing and working of ships in the Arctic Circles should be selected for such service . . . It follows therefore, that . . . it should be advisable . . . to hire one of the Greenland vessels and crew . . . The following statement was sent me some years past by Captain Brown, an able and expert seaman, regularly brought up in the Whale Fishery, who was willing to undertake the exploring Baffin's Bay, or endeavouring to approach the North Pole . . .

Sir:

Jan. 16, 1789

I shall begin fitting out the first of the month for Davis's Straits; and should you wish to explore Baffin's Bay, I shall be glad to have timely notice, that I may prepare . . . I have perused all the Northern voyages, and shall perfect myself in lunar observations.

William Brown  
Ship Butterworth."

Brown was several times quoted on observations in Baffin's Bay, namely on

the variation of the compass, and on soundings of more than a mile (5, pp. 248-255).

Vancouver expressed his satisfaction in having Brown's help in the explorations of the northwest coast of America, and drew on him for much information.

ALEXANDER STEWART is identified through reference to his brother, said (13; 25, p. 294) to be the Stewart of the *Bounty*, miscalled a mutineer. He was thus from Stromness, Orkney Islands. In 1787 he is noted (37) as second mate of the *Princess Royal* under Captain Duncan, and thus passed the winter of 1787-8 at the Hawaiian Islands.

Under Brown, Stewart commanded the *Jackall* when she visited the Hawaiian Islands in May or June 1792 and in February 1793. His last voyage under Brown's direction appears to have been at the end of 1793, when the indications (48, p. 8) are that (1) Brown's squadron reached the Hawaiian Islands from the Northwest Coast, (2) Brown despatched the *Butterworth* to England and transferred to the *Jackall*, (3) The *Jackall* and the *Prince Lee Boo* sailed for China. It seems clear that Stewart was not with Brown when the latter (returning from China in command of the *Jackall*) met Vancouver on the Northwest Coast in July, 1794 (80, V, 354-5).

According to Boit's journal entry in October, 1795, Stewart was then settled on Hawaii, after having left his vessel in the Hawaiian Islands. Thus, this parting should have been in 1793, as indicated, but of the location, there is some doubt. Vancouver, Bell and other diarists on Vancouver's ships cruising through the islands from January to March, 1794, make no mention of Stewart when discussing the foreign settlers in the group. Obviously he was not present. Furthermore, in January 1795, following the deaths of Brown and Gordon and the consequent need for navigating officers on the *Jackall* and the *Prince Lee Boo*, had Stewart been present, he could have resumed his command with personal advantage.

The point seems to be cleared up by the log of the ship *Eliza*, which Judge Howay has just unearthed and is publishing in the present report of the Society. The entry of March, 1799, mentions that Stewart parted from Brown in "Macou" (apparently Macao, China) and took passage in another ship to the Hawaiian Islands, where he planned to marry and settle down. Vessels were few, and the usual trade route was from China to the Northwest Coast, not calling at Hawaii until the return trip. It is quite probable then that Stewart did not return to Hawaii until 1795. In October of that year he was reported by Boit (13) and in August, 1798 by Townsend (75, p. 57) to be settled with Young at the village of Kawaihae, on Hawaii.

The 1799 report of the London Missionary Society (25, p. 294) mentions that in addition to "two very well behaved Englishmen, named Young and Davis" who "are in high favor with the chiefs and in great authority," Mr. Stewart "is settled with a family at Karakakoa, and is a man a respectability."

At the beginning of 1799, Stewart was at Oahu, sailing one of the king's schooners, and met the ship *Eliza*, whose commanding officer, Captain Rowan, was an old friend. Stewart's principal residence was still on Hawaii, where he was aiding the king in building schooners and navigating them. Soon afterwards, he accompanied Captain Duffin on the *Dove* to the Northwest Coast, where, on March 16, 1799, he again met the *Eliza*'s people (35a).

The last observation so far noted is by Turnbull (77, pp. 79, 80, 86) at the Hawaiian Islands in the winter of 1802-3. Among the foreign settlers he found "men of ability and knowledge; such as Mr. Young, Mr. Davis,

Captain Stewart, &c. &c. . . These gentlemen had employed themselves successfully in instructing the natives, and their extraordinary chief Tamahama in many useful arts, and particularly in that of navigation from island to island." Turnbull also remarks how valuable the three would be in aiding missionaries.

**SHARP AND GORDON.** Of Captain Sharp and Robert Gordon, successive commanders of the sloop Prince Lee Boo, nothing special has been noted. Sharp must have returned to London on the Butterworth. Gordon is described as "of London, Mariner," (11, p. 93). A Robert Gordon, of London, is listed among the subscribers to Meares' Voyages, published in 1790.

**SHIP BUTTERWORTH.** This ship is said to have been a French frigate of 30 guns (12). She was a Greenland whale-ship in 1789 rated at 392 tons under Brown's command (5, p. 251), and was referred to by Ingraham on the Northwest Coast as "a ship of 400 tons." She was unusually large for the fur-trade, and was regarded by Quadra (67) the Spanish commandant at Nootka in 1792, and by other Spanish commanders (4) as an English frigate of 30 guns bringing despatches to Vancouver. She was one of the largest vessels to call at the Hawaiian Islands after Cook's flagship, the Resolution, and was more imposing than Vancouver's flagship, the Discovery, which measured 340 tons (80, I, 44) and was armed with ten four-pounders and ten swivels (80, I, 50).

At the end of the fur-trading season of 1793, the Butterworth was sent south on a whaling and sealing trip and then to England (80, V, 354). In 1798 she was at the Marquesas Islands on another whaling cruise, and brought back a missionary to England in 1799 (25, pp. 261-2). In 1800, she is noted as leaving on another cruise in southern oceans (62a).

The Butterworth probably could be recorded as the first whale-ship to visit the Hawaiian Islands, although her whaling operations did not commence until she had left the islands for good.

Visiting the Hawaiian Islands three times, her log should contain important historical notes.

**SLOOPS JACKALL AND PRINCE LEE BOO.** The Jackall, so spelled by her officers, appears in some publications as "Jackall." She is generally called a sloop, but Vancouver refers to her as a schooner (80, IV, 112) and later, as a Cutter (80, VI, 399). Ingraham, using the commoner term, mentions the great show of force she made: "... a tier of ports for and aft the greater part of which were false or only painted yet they made a good appearance at a distance that for some time we concluded she was a King's Cutter or tender to some of the men of war on the coast."

The Prince Lee Boo is referred to either as a "sloop" or a "small sloop."

Boit, on Young's information calls them two sloops, and mentioned that Brown, in Honolulu harbor, "proceeded to alter one Vessel into a Ship, & the other one into a Cutter for to make them handier for cruising on the N. W. Coast."

The armament of the two vessels in 1795, according to Greathead, was "nine guns, 2 to 6 pounders."

The last voyage from Hawaii was to Canton, according to Boit. Bloxam (11, p. 94), writing in 1825, had information that the vessels arrived in China and were sold there, and that some of the crew remained at Hawaii. One of these, he stated, was Harbottle, later the pilot of Honolulu harbor.

The log of the Jackall, if ever found, would be of as great a value to Hawaiian history as that of the Butterworth.



A POSSIBLE NEO-MYTH. Following the presentation of this paper, the Honolulu Star-Bulletin published on December 20, 1933 a long letter entitled "Origin of name 'Honolulu.'" The letter is written with a positiveness as of authority, although the writer states: "I know of no documents which will corroborate this account and hesitate to give the manner in which the information came to me."

The important points of the account are the assertions that: Honolulu was named after the Honolulu stone in the Quadrass yard; the stone is a female fish-god named Honolulu belonging to a Princess Kealohilani who maintained it on her land of Honolulu in the Puna district, Island of Hawaii; it was stolen by enemies of the Princess, brought to Oahu and placed in its present situation which was formerly *in the middle of a fish-pond*; the occurrence was in "the first part of the 18th century, perhaps much earlier . . . have no dates for this."

As the present site of the Quadrass stone is a slope which is continuous from the central mountain ridge, obviously it could never have been occupied by a fish-pond. According to a resident (81) of the vicinity and a well-known authority on native folklore, some of the minor statements of fact are correct and others incorrect, while most of the myth material in the account has been misapplied.

Through the association of the name Kealohilani with the stone, the account tends to confirm the suggestion on p. 58 that the "Honolulu stone" stories are neo-mythic.

---

#### REFERENCES

1. Adams, A. Extracts from an ancient log. Hawaiian Annual for 1906, pp. 66-74. Honolulu, 1906
2. Arago, J. Promenade autour du monde; II, 195. Paris, 1822.
3. Ballou, H. M., and Carter, G. R. History of Hawaiian Mission Press. Papers No. 14, Hawaiian Historical Society.
4. Bancroft, H. H. History of the Northwest Coast. San Francisco, 1884. I, 265, quoting from Sutil y Mexicana, Viage, 116.
5. Barrington and Beaufoy, The possibility of approaching the North Pole asserted by the Hon. D. Barrington. A new edition with an appendix containing papers on the same subject and on a North West passage, by Colonel Beaufoy, F. R. S. London, 1818.
6. [Bell,] Journal of H. B. M. Chatham; Hawaiian portion. (Photostat in Hawaiian Historical Society.)
7. [Bell,] A new Vancouver journal of the discovery of Puget Sound, edited by E. S. Meany. Seattle, 1915.
8. Bingham, H. A residence of twenty-one years in the Sandwich Islands. Hartford, 1847.
9. Bishop, C. Log of ship Ruby, MS., entry Sept. 16, 1795. (Copy in Archives of Hawaii.)
10. Bloxam, A. Diary on H.M.S Blonde, 1824-5. Original MS.
11. Bloxam, A. Diary of Andrew Bloxam naturalist of the "Blonde" on her trip from England to the Hawaiian Islands 1824-25. Bishop Museum Special Publication 10, Honolulu, 1925. (Published from a transcription or recension of the original).
12. Boit, J. Jr. Log of the Columbia, 1790-1793. Reprint, Oregon Historical Quarterly, XXII, No. 4. Portland, 1921. (Quoting Howay, p. 326.)



13. Boit, J. Jr. MS. journal of a voyage round the world [Sloop Union,] entry, Oct. 16, 1795. (Photostat in Library of Hawaiian Mission Children's Society.)
14. Broughton, W. R. Voyage of discovery . . in H. S. Sloop Providence, 1795-8 London, 1804.
15. Campbell, A. A voyage round the world, 1806-1812. Edinburgh, 1816, p. 157.
16. Carter, G. R. A new document of John Young. Hawaiian Historical Society, 32nd Ann. Rep., Honolulu, 1924, p. 52.
17. Cartwright, B. The first discovery of Honolulu harbor. Hawaiian Historical Society, 31st Ann. Rep. Honolulu, 1923.
18. Chamberlain, L. MS. journal. Copy in Library, Hawaiian Mission Children's Society.
19. Choris, L. Voyage pittoresque autour du monde; Isles Sandwich, pl. IX. Paris, 1822.
20. Corney, P. Voyages in the Northern Pacific, 1813-8. Honolulu, 1896.
21. Cox, R. Adventures on the Columbia River . . London, 1831. I, 34.
22. Dibble, S. A history of the Sandwich Islands. Reprint. Honolulu, 1909.
23. Dixon, G. A voyage round the world, 1785-8. London, 1789. p. 102.
24. Ellis, W. Narrative of a tour through Hawaii. London, 1828.
25. Evangelical Magazine, vol. VII. London, 1799.
26. Fornander, A. The Polynesian Race. 3 vols. London, 1878-1885.
27. Fornander Collection of Hawaiian antiquities and folklore. Bishop Museum memoirs, IV-VI.
28. Freycinet, L. de. Voyage autour du monde, 1817-20. Historique, II. Paris, 1829. Botanique par Ch. Gaudichaud, Paris, 1826.
- 28a. Godwin, G. Vancouver, A Life, 1757-1798. New York, 1931.
29. Golovnin, V. Puteshestvie Vokrug Svieta . . Na Shliupe Kamchatke, 1817-9. St. Petersburg, 1822.
30. Greatheed, S., The Manuscript of. The Friend, Honolulu, June 1862, pp. 42-3.
31. Hart, E. H. Interpreter, Archives of Hawaii.
32. Hawaiian Government Museum. MS. catalogue, now in Bishop Museum.
33. Hoku o ka Pakipika, Honolulu, Apr. 3, 1862, p. 4, Ka moolelo no Hiia-kapoliiopele.
- 33a. Howay, F. W. [Ed.] The Dixon-Meares Controversy. Toronto, 1929.
34. Howay, F. W. Early relations between the Hawaiian Islands and the Northwest Coast. Publications of the Archives of Hawaii, No. 5. Honolulu, 1930.
35. Howay, F. W. The last days of the Atahualpa, alias Behring. 41st Ann. Rep. Hawaiian Historical Society, Honolulu 1933.
- 35a. Howay, F. W. The ship Eliza at Hawaii in 1799. 42nd Ann. Rep. Hawaiian Historical Society, Honolulu, 1934.
36. Hunnewell, J. Voyage in the Brig Bordeaux Packet Boston to Honolulu, 1817. Papers No. 8. Hawaiian Historical Society, p. 5.
37. Ingraham, J. MS. Journal of the voyage of the Brigantine Hope, 1790-2. (Photostat in Bishop Museum.)
38. Jarves, J. J. History of the Sandwich or Hawaiian Islands. Boston, 1843.
39. Judd, H. P. Hawaiian proverbs and riddles. Bulletin 77, Bishop Museum. p. 53.
40. Judd, H. P. Hawaiian philologist.
41. Kamakau, S. M. Ka Nupepa Kuokoa, Honolulu, June 22, 1865.
42. Kamakau, S. M. Ka Nupepa Kuokoa Honolulu June 1, 1867
43. Kamakau, S. M. Chant of Kualii. Bishop Museum Memoirs, IV, 400-1.

44. Kopa, G. C. Assistant registrar of conveyances and Hawaiian interpreter.
45. Kelsey, T. Hawaiian interpreter.
46. Kotzebue, Otto von. *Entdeckungs-Reise . . in den Jahren 1815-8 . . aus dem Schisse Rurick*. Weimar, 1821. II, 33.
47. Kotzebue, Otto von. *Niue Reise um die Welt*. 1825-6. Weimar, 1830. II, 85.
48. Kuykendall, R. S. A Northwest trader at the Hawaiian Islands. Reprint, *Oregon Historical Quarterly*, XXIV, No. 2. Eugene, 1923.
49. Land Commission. Indices of awards made by the Board of Commissioners to quiet Land Titles. Honolulu, 1929.
50. Loomis, Mrs. Maria. Journal. (Copy in library, Hawaiian Mission Children's Society.)
51. Makinney, F. W. Abstract attorney.
52. Malden, C. R. A plan of the harbour of Honoruru, 1825. Reprint, *Honolulu Advertiser*, August 21, 1933.
53. Malo, D. Hawaiian antiquities. Honolulu, 1903.
54. Manby, T. MS. journal. (Photostat in Archives of Hawaii.)
- 54a. Manning, W. R. The Nootka Sound Controversy. Ann. Rep. American Historical Association for 1904. Washington, 1905.
55. Marin, F. de Paula y. Letters in Archives of Hawaii.
56. Martin, J. Account of the natives of the Tongan Islands . . communications of Mr. William Mariner. London, 1818. I, 37.
57. Mathison, G. F. Narrative of a visit to Brazil, Chile, Peru and the Sandwich Islands, 1821-2. London, 1825. p. 363.
58. Meares, J. *Voyages*. London, 1790.
59. Menzies, A. *Hawaii Nei 128 years ago*. Edited by W. F. Wilson. Honolulu, 1920.
60. Menzies, A. New journal of Vancouver's Voyage. Edited by C. F. Newcombe. *Memoirs V*, Archives of British Columbia. Victoria, 1923.
- 60a. Miller, W. Consul General to Hawaii, in Despatches to the British Foreign Office p. 97. (quoting from an English translation of Ke-kuanaoa's testimony.)
61. Morris, P. C. Abstract attorney.
62. Mossman, G. F. Hawaiian interpreter.
- 62a. *Naval Chronicle*. Vol. III. London, 1800, p. 239.
63. *Naval Chronology*, by Isaac Schomberg, London, 1802. Vol. II, p. 157.
64. Peabody, Miss Lucy. Hawaiian authority on folklore and genealogies; quoted by Mrs. Lahilahi Webb.
65. Péron. *Memoires du Capitaine Péron*. Paris 1824. II, 145.
66. Portlock, N. *Voyage round the world, 1785-8*. London, 1789.
67. Quadra. MS diary (in Spanish) of the voyage to North-west America by Capt. J. F. de la Bodega y Quadra in 1792. Quotations from Maggs Bros. Catalogue No. 465, p. 360.
68. Ross, A. *Adventures of the first settlers on the Oregon or Columbia River . .* London, 1849. p. 34.
69. Stokes, J. F. G. Evaluation of early genealogies used for Polynesian history. *Jnl. Polynesian Society*, vol. 39, no. 1. 1930.
70. Stokes, J. F. G. Origin of the condemnation of Captain Cook in Hawaii. 39th ann. rep. Hawaiian Historical Society. Honolulu, 1931.
71. Stokes, J. F. G. The Hawaiian king. Papers No. 19, Hawaiian Historical Society. Honolulu, 1932.
72. Stokes, J. F. G. New bases for Hawaiian chronology. 41st ann. rep. Hawaiian Historical Society. Honolulu, 1933.
73. Tracy, C. H. Attorney.

74. Thrum, T. G. Tales from the temples. Hawaiian Annual, p. 56 Honolulu, 1907.
75. Townsend, E. Jr. The diary of Mr. Ebenezer Townsend Jr. the supercargo of the sealing ship "Neptune" . . Papers, Vol. IV, New Haven Colony Historical Society.
76. Tregear, E. Maori-Polynesian comparative dictionary. Wellington, 1891.
77. Turnbull, J. Voyage round the world, 1800-4. 3 vols. London, 1805.
78. Tyerman D. and Bennet, G. Journal of voyages and travels . . London, 1831. I, 396.
79. U. S. Fish Commission, Bulletin, XXIII, 1-12. Washington, 1905.
80. Vancouver, G. Voyage of discovery to the North Pacific Ocean . . 1790-5. 6 vols. London, 1801.
81. Webb, Mrs. E. Lahilahi. Hawaiian reference authority and interpreter.
82. Westervelt, W. D. Legends of Old Honolulu. Boston 1916.
83. [Whitney and Richards] Ka Hoikehonua . . Oahu, 1832.
84. Wyllie, R. C. Investigation . . land in Honolulu claimed by Richard Charlton, Esq. Honolulu, 1846. p. 15.

## THE SHIP ELIZA AT HAWAII IN 1799

By JUDGE F. W. HOWAY

## I. INTRODUCTION

The ship *Eliza* was built at Providence, Rhode Island, in 1796. She was of 159 36/95 tons burthen; length, 70 feet 10 inches; beam, 28 feet 8 inches; depth 12 feet 1 inch. Her registered owners were T. H. Perkins, James Perkins, S. G. Perkins, Stephen Higginson and George Higginson.<sup>1</sup>

In 1798 the *Eliza* left Boston on her first, and only, voyage to the Northwest Coast. It was planned as a combination of maritime fur-trade and smuggling adventure on the coast of California. The ship was under the control and direction of her principal owners, the firm of J. & T. H. Perkins of Boston. Her officers on this voyage were James Rowan, master; Mr. Holbrook, first mate; Mr. Bumstead, second mate, and John Kendrick, Jr., supercargo. She carried twenty-four men, including the officers. A somewhat personal journal, kept by Mr. Burling, the clerk of the vessel, enables us to have a view of the officers.<sup>2</sup>

The master, James Rowan, had been on the Northwest Coast in 1793 and 1794 with Captain John Kendrick, as mate of the *Lady Washington*. After Kendrick's tragic death on December 13, 1794, Rowan took command and sailed the little brigantine (as she then was) back to China. Later he was with Captain Lay on the little English cutter, *Dragon*, on a voyage from China to the Northwest Coast and return. This was in 1797. At the end of the venture he sailed to Boston, and, arriving there a short time before the *Eliza* sailed, his experience secured him her command.<sup>3</sup>

Mr. Holbrook, the first officer, had been long employed by the Perkins firm in the West Indian trade. "He was a fine fellow, prompt and active as he was bold and efficacious,—our old acquaintance of the counting-house where he was always welcome to us from the West Indies with pines and oranges."<sup>4</sup>

Mr. Bumstead, the second mate, was a man of good education and well connected, belonging to a family in which the principal owners were interested. He had made a voyage to the coast, and

<sup>1</sup> See Notes on Pages 112 and 113.

had amusing stories to tell of life in the Hawaiian Islands and on Tinian, where he had spent some time. "He had good nature and much humour; but had a bad habit of not being able to get awake when called. The mate and myself sometimes vied with each other in the monstrous stories that we told to rouse him from his berth, and had many a hearty laugh when we got to breakfast next morning at the disappointment he expressed at the vessels he 'had not seen,' and the expected unusual appearance of the heavens 'that did not appear' after we had left the deck."<sup>5</sup>

John Kendrick, Jr., the supercargo, was the eldest son of the well-known Captain John Kendrick. He had been fifth mate of the *Columbia*, when under his father's command, she sailed from Boston, in 1787. At Nootka Sound, in July, 1789, he left the *Columbia* and entered the Spanish navy.<sup>6</sup> "The Spanish commandant took entire charge of young Kendrick's fortunes, but was only able to establish the young adventurer as a pilot in one of the Galleons from Acapulco to ye Phillipine Islands."<sup>7</sup> To quote from the journal: "Our supercargo, Kendrick, seemed as amiable as honest; and although a deep thinker was as slow of speech as Dominie Sampson. Nevertheless he felt willing to be entertained by the humours of my watch mates, and occasionally told us strange and even humorous stories of the strange people with whom he had been so long sojourning. Little by little we could get glimpses of his life, his hopes, and his feelings."<sup>8</sup>

The well-known William Sturgis, who later became master of Boston trading vessels and still later was a member of the mercantile, ship-owning house of Bryant & Sturgis, then a mere boy of seventeen years of age, was one of the green foremast hands. For a time Sturgis was first mate on another ship—the *Ulysses*; but in China he rejoined the *Eliza* as third mate, and occupied that position throughout the homeward voyage, which ended in the spring of 1800.<sup>9</sup>

The last person to be mentioned of the crew of the *Eliza* is the man who kept the journal to which we are indebted for so many intimate touches revealing the men and the life. This journal has been called (and, indeed, is usually cited as) William Sturgis' journal, perhaps because it has a sentence or two which have great verbal similarity to some to be found in his address upon "The



Northwest Fur Trade.” The internal evidence, however, points to Mr. Burling as the journalist.

The statement by Charles G. Loring that the *Eliza* carried a crew of 136 men is a gross exaggeration; and those that follow, to the effect that this number was for defence against Indian aggression and that the voyage was one of great discomfort owing to so many persons being cooped up in a small vessel, are simply baseless and gratuitous fancies.<sup>10</sup> She carried only 24 men as already stated.

The *Eliza* sailed from Boston about August 15, 1798.<sup>11</sup> At the outset the conditions upon her do not seem to have been at all pleasant. A mutual suspicion between captain and supercargo split the ship's company, for a time, into two potentially hostile camps. Misunderstandings and suspicions between captains and supercargoes were common enough; but in this case Kendrick thought that Rowan knew more about his father's affairs than he had told. This matter has been further touched upon in a note hereto. And besides: the fact that Rowan was “a good practical seaman, without education or much theoretical knowledge of navigation,”<sup>12</sup> whilst Kendrick combined theory and practice, gave additional grounds for jealousy and mutual recriminations.

Pursuing the regular route, the *Eliza* reached the Falkland Islands in November, 1798. After a short delay to obtain wood and water, the ship resumed her voyage.<sup>13</sup> Taking her course through the Straits of LeMaire, she entered the Pacific Ocean and steered for the Hawaiian Islands. The date of her arrival at “the islands” is not given in the journal, but judging from the usual time occupied in the passage from Boston, it would probably be early in January, 1799.<sup>14</sup>

It is not the intention of this paper to sketch in detail the voyage of the *Eliza*, nor to touch upon her as a pioneer in smuggling and illicit trade on the coast of California (then New Spain) under the specious pretext of putting into such ports in order to repair and to obtain wood and water. The object is merely to present the following account of the occurrences during her short stay at the islands of Hawaii and Oahu; and this introduction has run to this length in an endeavor to present a proper background. It is felt that the human interest of the document renders this extract worthy of publication.

## II. THE JOURNAL

We were soon running off speedily towards the North West for Owhyhee and were already thinking of plantains and bread fruit, as well as other tropicals; about which Rowan and the second mate<sup>15</sup> were most eloquent. Porpoises occasionally crossed our route, and dolphins and barracudas enlivened the passage of the ship. Our crew were kept in motion to avoid the scurvy, and the moonlight nights were enlivened by the songs of the forecastle, as well as their long stories. Our captain began to unbend with some of *his yarns*, which had less decency than wit; and Mr. Kendrick gave some sketches of Mexican manners at San Blas as well as the Missions of California.<sup>16</sup> The second mate too told of the wonders of the island of Tinian, where he had much enjoyment on his first voyage, notwithstanding that himself and companions were hard pressed with the scurvy.

In a few days we were on the lookout in our ship for the summit of Manaroah, the loftiest point of Owhyhee;<sup>17</sup> and at length I was roused by our now sociable captain to have a sight of the long looked for mountain, but instead of beholding it towering above the waves when I came on deck I only got sight of it low in the western horizon and seeming as our green hands quaintly said to be not much higher than a good corn hill. This was before sunrise; and when the sun got above the horizon the supposed mountain faded from our view; and we got no more sight of it until past six in the evening, when we had run with a fresh breeze, and most of our steering sails set, between 90 and 100 miles. Mr. Holbrook, our mate, then discovered it coming through the mist *above the foreyard*.

We kept the ship off to the northward along shore, and soon got sight of the east point of Owhyhee, from which we stretched along with the tend of the island towards its northern end, where we luffed round into Toacaiya Bay,<sup>18</sup> with a tolerable safe anchorage. Before coming to this we passed the lofty island of Mowee, not far distant from its more majestic neighbour.

The eastern end of Owhyhee is rather barren; and we therefore saw few spots of tempting vegetation on that part. It has been said that it was formerly occupied by a hardy and warlike population whom Temahemaya had most trouble to subdue when he

obtained possession of the government of Owyhee. The courses of his rise to regal power are not generally known. His rank was high before the death of the old king; for it is known that at the time of Cook's death, he (Temahemaha) was with a brother of his own and the old king, his uncle, in Cook's boats on their way as hostages to the ships.

On his uncle's death <sup>19</sup> at a later period, Temahemaha's cousins claimed and took the sovereignty; one of them finally got the ascendancy; but in the previous struggle party feelings ran high, and discontented chiefs were too numerous under the new King. They tempted Temayhamaya to set himself up against his cousin, and levied forces in his (Temahemaha's) behalf; but on their marching to battle they before the onset exacted from Temahemaha promises of the better portion of the island as their own reward. The unfortunate aspirant was obliged to submit to their terms; and by their aid finally gained a decisive battle; <sup>20</sup> but having been left with too small possessions his confederates soon became discontented, and made insurrections against him.

They found however to their cost that Temahemaya had a stronger mind than his predecessors. He suddenly attacked them in detail, and stripped them of their new possessions, annexing them to the Crown, and thus strengthening himself for future conquests, promising at the same time to the subjected chiefs increase of estates when they should help him to win them for him in the other islands. Not long after he suddenly passed over to and occupied Mowee and the two adjoining islands—Whahoo being all that was left that could excite rebellion at home, and Attoway, the leeward isle, being too far removed to excite disturbances or desire of further conquest.

But Temahemaya was not left long in quiet. Tiannah, <sup>21</sup> a gigantic chief of Attoway, excited alarms in Owyhee in the King's absence, and the King concluded he should never have rest until Oahu [*sic*] at least was secured to his own government. He had passed over to the adjacent islands occupying them in succession; but when in front of Oahu he got news of the rising of his lately reduced chiefs in the eastern part of Owyhee. With great judgment he pushed over to Oahu and terminated his conquest; then he unexpectedly returned on the insurgents behind him at home

and extinguished altogether the caste of the eastern chiefs. After this he had reigned quietly.<sup>22</sup>

We were allowed to anchor quietly outside the reefs, where we busied ourselves putting the ship to rights till night. Then a King's canoe came off and advised us there was a general tabu on all the island which was the cause that no canoes came off to us with provisions and fruit. They said that the King was at the other side the island; but notice of our arrival had been forwarded to him. The chief who came off said we could ourselves land and purchase provisions as well as water, if we were in a hurry.

The appearance of this bay was rather dry and burnt up; but the natives seemed to be in active motion, many of them putting up temporary huts to accommodate us when we went on shore on the morrow. We were not however left without visitors till next day; for it was not fairly dark before parties of females came off to us swimming to obtain presents and offer civilities. We were amused with the freedom of their manners, and the easiness with which they attached themselves to every new face. Some even brought off a few sweet potatoes or plantains on their heads, swimming a distance of over two miles, and had the satisfaction of being well paid for them as well as having their share to eat. The vegetables, etc., were most acceptable to us, after being deprived of potatoes since we passed Cape Horn. While much amusement was going on between our crew and their visitors, a second canoe was suddenly perceived pulling towards us. It proved to be the chief of the district, who came to advise us that the King was on his way to us and had sent an express to advise us of his approach and desire that we would not hurry.

We had some difficulty to conceal the women on board that could not escape; but the most of them stole away, swimming. However our new visitor did not appear to desire to discover the breakers of the tabu; whose punishment, if detected, would have been death; but satisfied himself with looking round the vessel from curiosity only. He seemed a plain main of quiet manners, and not to be of high rank. We found it was the present King's policy not to put the chiefs of high class into command of the district; and thus this one had nothing very taking or commanding in his manners. After making him some small presents he departed.

One or two solitary visitors returned to us; but after them we remained quiet till the next morning.

After having early breakfast we had the long boat under way towards the shore to obtain water; and at a later hour Mr. Kendrick and myself went off in the whale boat to procure supplies of fruit and vegetables to guard against the scurvy's getting hold of our crew. Our owners had taken every precaution against the approach of so fatal an enemy to the prosperity of our voyage; for our supply of potatoes had been abundant for the same, and we had been provided also with Indian meal and molasses, as well as vinegar most bountifully. The good effects of these precautions were seen in the fine health of our crew. The only invalid was our boatswain, who had been off duty ever since we got to the Falkland Islands; and we of the cabin were bad enough to think that laziness and the fear of cold weather were principally the cause of his laying by. Under this belief Mr. Holbrook had tried experiments to rouse him, until he had made serious inroads on the supplies of our medicine chest. His continued bad health and unwillingness to exert himself had induced the captain to consent to his being left at Oahu, to see what a change of climate would do by the time we came back, for his constitution.

On the approach of Mr. Kendrick and myself to the beach in our whale boat, several stout natives took us out of the boat in their arms and carried us through the surf up to dry sand. A throng of men and women then surrounded and followed us to the shade of a tree, by which we had seated ourselves. A petty chief civilly formed a circle round us and tabooed the interior; so that we had the advantage of fresh air and opportunity to examine the surrounding crowd, from whom we began to collect supplies of potatoes, yams, plantains, and bananas, and a few oranges. For these we paid in combs, scissors, and small looking glasses. Our business transactions were satisfactory to the crowd, and occasionally Mr. Bumstead came to enliven us with a visit, and remove our purchases to the long boat.

On its going back with its first load Mr. Holbrook returned next trip to see the village and make acquaintance with the natives. His fun and humour made quite a stir among our crowd, so much so, that we became almost willing to part with him, so as to go on with our business, soberly.



During our stay on shore the traders, mostly women, found them selves puzzled to determine whether Kendrick or myself were of the highest rank in the order of chiefs; and had great contests of opinion on this weighty subject among themselves. We were entreated to the verge of our charmed circle and requested to exhibit our hands. I expected we were to be then entertained with a specimen of fortune telling, but on our hands being shown I perceived the contest about our grade of nobility was renewed, and it seemed as if we were not likely to have an end of the question. My hands, by keeping watch and pulling ropes, had become much harder than Kendrick's; but my nails had got of unsightly length since I had devoted myself so much to reading and writing.<sup>24</sup> We were then obliged to acknowledge our grade *on board ship* that tranquillity might be restored to the crowd and we make greater advance in our purchases. With the second boat load of water we were enabled to return on board much amused with our jaunt.

Finding we had about cleared the bay of supplies we determined on sailing for Oahu with the night wind, and there complete our purchases by obtaining some hogs and a supply of the tara root. This valuable vegetable, something resembling the yam, is grown under water one part of the season, and is found in more abundance at Oahu, where the soil is better and the supplies of water more constant. The leaf of the plant as it grows, shoots out of the water. Among the enclosures for growing the taro the water is kept four to eight inches above the surface of the soil from which the tarah rises in rows, or rather beds, and in the openings between these the fresh water mullets are seen swimming about in a half domesticated state. This was Capt. R.'s description to us which I afterwards found to be correct.

With the night breeze we lifted anchor and fanned with the evening breeze outside the north point where we lay becalmed for the sea breeze next day. With the sea breeze we ran for Oahu and anchored before next night. We triced up our boarding nettings to guard against thefts during our sleep, but this did not prevent some female company paying us visits by moonlight, for here there was no taboo to restrain them. On the day following we had as much company as we needed, and our trade for provisions went on

quite lively. The chief who ruled Oahu by delegated authority from Temahamaya came on board from a smaller schooner of the King's which carried English colours.<sup>25</sup> She was commanded by an Englishman by the name of Stewart who had left his vessel at these islands at a former period, influenced, as we were told, by his partiality for a young female of Owhyhee, where he had since resided and aided the King in constructing some schooners to trade among the islands, as well as to control them.

Stewart and Capt. R., were old acquaintances, and had much private conversation together when he first came on board. Stewart afterwards took some little pains to speak to me in the captain's favour, and Mr. Holbrook also had hints from him to the same effect; but nothing was said directly to Mr. K. whom we supposed it was intended should be influenced at second-hand.<sup>26</sup> There was not much carousing between the captain and his friend at night, although we were given to understand they had *formerly* had high times together.

Next day we towed out aided with a light land air and by ten o'clock we took the sea breeze and leave of our island friends as well as Captain Stewart, who had on reaching his vessel given us a salute of four guns, which Capt. R., was rather slow in returning as he said he had sworn since Captain Kendrick's death he would salute no vessel in a hurry, except at safe distance.<sup>27</sup> An increasing strong trade wind now carried us rapidly towards the north-east and cool weather.

### III. CONCLUDING NOTE

Alexander Stewart, the person referred to as commanding the King's schooner, had been in command of the British schooner or cutter, *Jackal*, in the maritime fur-trade on the Northwest Coast during 1792 and 1793. His vessel was one of three ships that constituted the Brown squadron, under the control of Captain William Brown. In 1794 when Vancouver met the *Jackal* on the coast she was in command of Captain Brown; see Vancouver's *Voyage*, 8vo ed. vol. v, pp. 354f, 405. Captain Stewart had left her, but whether at Hawaii or in China is uncertain. In March 1799 the *Eliza* met the *Dove* near Sitka and learned that Alexander Stewart was on board. The following quotation from the manuscript

Sturgis' journal of the *Eliza*, under date, March 16, 1799, is reproduced as a contribution to the question.

"We learned that Mr. Stewart who formerly commanded the *Jackall* on the Coast when she was in Company with the Butterworth, Captain Brown, was with Captain Duffin [on the ship *Dove*] in quality of sailing master. This was the man we had stopped at Whahoo to see; in hopes he would be able to give us information what vessels were on the Coast, and what ones had gone down to China the last season. We were disappointed in seeing him by his being at Mowee, where he had seen us pass by but not knowing who we were or where we were going he did not come off to see us. Stewart, it seems, when he commanded the *Jackall* had a difference with Captain Brown (who had the control of both ships) and left him in Macou: he soon afterwards took passage for the Sandwich Isles, determined to reside there for the rest of his life; in which resolution he was assisted by a violent affection that he entertained for a Girl there; and with whom I suppose he then thought he could be happy with in any situation between a Palace and a Cottage: time however that . . . gradually undermines all things (therefore Love need not be ashamed to be vanquished by such a Conqueror) had so weakened his affection that Captain D[uffin] found it no greater difficulty to persuade him again to visit the Coast and in fact I believe he was as willing to come as Captain Duffin to have him."

The reference to the failure of the *Eliza* to meet Captain Stewart at Oahu is unintelligible in view of the statements regarding his conversations with Captain Rowan.

New Westminster, B. C.

F. W. HOWAY.

#### NOTES

- 1 Boston Register of Ships, manuscript.
- 2 William Sturgis' journal (so-called) in the Massachusetts Historical Society, manuscript. Though holding the view that this journal is the work of Mr. Burling, I quote it as "Sturgis' journal" in deference to its catalogued name.
- 3 Sturgis' journal, p. 2.
- 4 *Id.*, pp. 4, 6.
- 5 *Id.*, pp. 4, 7.
- 6 See my article on "John Kendrick and His Sons," in *Oregon Historical Quarterly*, vol. xxiii, pp. 277ff, at p. 296.
- 7 Sturgis' journal, p. 1.
- 8 *Id.*, p. 7.
- 9 *Id.*, p. 4; *Memoir of the Hon. William Sturgis*, by C. G. Loring, Boston, 1864, pp. 6ff.

- 10 Loring's *Memoir*, ante, p. 6.
- 11 Sturgis' journal, p. 4.
- 12 Loring's *Memoir*, p. 6.
- 13 Sturgis' journal, pp. 19f.
- 14 Furthermore the *Eliza* reached the Northwest Coast, near Sitka, Alaska, on February 13, 1799. She had only delayed a few days at "the islands," and the passage thence to the coast usually occupied about a month.
- 15 The captain, James Rowan, and the second mate, Mr. Bumstead.
- 16 John Kendrick, Jr., had been in Mexico and New Spain from 1789 till his return to Boston, some time before the *Eliza* sailed in August, 1798.
- 17 Mauna Loa rises to 13,675 feet; but it is not the loftiest point in the island. It is exceeded by Mauna Kea, 13,825 feet.
- 18 Kawaihae Bay.
- 19 Kalaniopuu, the King of Hawaii.
- 20 The battle of Mokuohai.
- 21 Kaiana, the chief so frequently mentioned by Meares. See Portlock's *Voyage* (London, 1789) also.
- 22 For the historical version of these matters, see *A History of Hawaii*, by R. S. Kuykendall, (New York, 1926), pp. 63-69.
- 24 The clerk, Mr. Burling, who kept this journal had early in the voyage taken charge with William Sturgis of the mizzen topgallant sail, in order as he said "to learn to be a sailor as well as a supercargo"; but later, owing to some taunts, had desisted. Kendrick, on the other hand, as supercargo had taken no part in handling the sails.
- 25 Was this the schooner *Britannia*, built for the King in 1794, by Vancouver? See Vancouver's *Voyage*, 8vo ed., vol. v, pp. 29, 30, 86. It may have been the *Fair American* or even one of the recently built vessels; though the British flag seems to point to the *Britannia*.
- 26 This alludes to a feeling supposed to have existed in John Kendrick, Jr., that Rowan, who as mate of the *Lady Washington*, had brought her to China after Captain Kendrick's death, might know something of the affairs of the latter and his supposed wealth which had disappeared. But Kendrick's letter to Barrell, March 28, 1792, in *Oregon Historical Quarterly*, vol. 30, pp. 96f, shows that he, Captain Kendrick, was then in debt over \$13,000.
- 27 Alluding to the accidental death of Captain John Kendrick on December 13, 1794, in Honolulu Harbour. His vessel, the *Lady Washington* was being saluted by the *Jackal* under Captain William Brown. By an oversight, one gun was not unshotted; as a result, its ball pierced the *Lady Washington* and killed her captain.

## LIST OF MEMBERS

## HONORARY

Howay, Judge F. W., New Westminster, B. C.

## LIFE

|                        |                        |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Atherton, Frank C.     | Phillips, Stephen W.   |
| Atkinson, R. W.        | Robinson, Mark A.      |
| Baldwin, Mrs. Emily A. | Spaulding, Thomas M.   |
| Bishop, E. F.          | Swanzy, Mrs. F. M.     |
| Brown, C. A.           | Tenney, E. D.          |
| Cartwright, Bruce      | Westervelt, W. D.      |
| Marx, Mrs. Eioise C.   | Westervelt, Mrs. W. D. |
| Midkiff, Frank E.      | Westervelt, Andrew C.  |
|                        | Wilcox, Gaylord P.     |

## ANNUAL

|                         |                          |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Ai, C. K.               | Burbank, Miss Mary A.    |
| Alexander, Arthur C.    | Canavarro, Miss Helen    |
| Anderson, D. W.         | Carter, A. Hartwell      |
| Anderson, Robbins B.    | Carter, A. W.            |
| Balch, John A.          | Carter, Mrs. A. W.       |
| Baldwin, William D.     | Carter, Mrs. George R.   |
| Beckley, Mrs. Mary C.   | Castle, Alfred L.        |
| Bennett, Mrs. George Y. | Castle, Dorothy          |
| Billson, Marcus K.      | Castle, H. K. L.         |
| Blue, George Verne      | Castle, Mrs. Ida Tenney  |
| Bode, R. R.             | Castle, W. R.            |
| Boyer, F. O.            | Castro, A. D.            |
| Bradley, Harold W.      | Catton, Robert, Sr.      |
| Brown, Francis H. I.    | Caum, E. L.              |
| Brown, George I.        | Chamberlain, W. W.       |
| Bryan, Edwin H., Jr.    | Clarke, Mrs. J. Comstock |
| Bryant, Mrs. Gerald     | Collins, George M.       |
| Buck, P. H.             | Colson, Warren H.        |



Cooke, Mrs. A. F.  
 Cooke, Clarence H.  
 Cooke, C. Montague  
 Cooke, George P.  
 Cooke, J. Platt  
 Cooke, Thomas E.  
 Cooper, C. Bryant  
 Crane, Charles S.  
 Cross, Ermine  
 Damon, B. H. B.  
 Damon, Miss Ethel M.  
 Damon, Mrs. H. F.  
 Damon, Miss May M.  
 Dillingham, Walter F.  
 Dole, Miss Emily C.  
 Dunkhase, Mrs. Carl  
 Ellis, Thomas W.  
 Emerson, Mrs. J. S.  
 Emory, Kenneth P.  
 Erdman, John P.  
 Fernandes, Frank F.  
 Fleming, D. F.  
 Fleming, John L.  
 Franck, Rev. Fr. Valentin  
 Frear, W. F.  
 Frear, Mrs. W. F.  
 Gartley, Mrs. Ada J.  
 Gibson, T. H.  
 Goodale, Mrs. E. Whitney  
 Green, Miss Caroline P.  
 Greene, Ernest W.  
 Greenwell, Mrs. E. C.  
 Gregory, Herbert E.  
 Halford, F. J.  
 Handy, E. S. C.  
 Hart, Henry H.  
 Hemenway, C. R.  
 Hinckley, Thurston R.

Hobbs, Miss Jean  
 Holstein, H. L.  
 Hooley, O. E.  
 Hotze, Henry  
 Houston, Victor S. K.  
 Howell, Hugh  
 Hunnewell, James M.  
 Iaukea, Curtis P.  
 Jones, Miss Maude  
 Judd, Albert F.  
 Judd, Miss Bernice  
 Judd, Miss E. Pauahi  
 Judd, Henry P.  
 Kimball, George P.  
 King, S. W.  
 Konze, Rev. Fr. Sebastian  
 Kuykendall, R. S.  
 Larsen, Nils P.  
 Leebrick, K. C.  
 Lewis, Jr., A.  
 Lind, Andrew W.  
 Littell, Bishop S. H.  
 Low, Miss Mary E.  
 Lowrey, F. J.  
 Lowrey, Mrs. Sherwood  
 Luquiens, Huc M.  
 Lyman, Levi C.  
 McCandless, L. L.  
 McCandless, Mrs. L. L.  
 McClellan, Edwin North  
 MacDonald, Miss Ida G.  
 MacIntyre, Miss Janet L.  
 McKay, William  
 Marx, B. L.  
 Massee, Edward K.  
 Mist, H. W. M.  
 Morgan, Mrs. Margaret K.  
 Mori, I.

Morris, Penrose C.  
 Newman, Miss Margaret  
 Nowell, Allen M.  
 Odgers, George A.  
 Palmer, Harold S.  
 Parsons, Charles F.  
 Perry, Antonio  
 Petrie, Thomas H.  
 Phillips, J. T.  
 Poepoe, Andrew K.  
 Potter, G. C.  
 Rawlins, Miss M. F.  
 Restarick, Arthur E.  
 Restarick, Mrs. Arthur E.  
 Restarick, Mrs. Henry B.  
 Richards, Mrs. Atherton  
 Robertson, Mrs. A. G. M.  
 Robinson, Mrs. C. J.  
 Ross, Mrs. Ernest  
 Ross, G. A. Johnston  
 Sellander, W. H.  
 Shaw, Miss Ruth C.  
 Sinclair, Gregg  
 Smith, Arthur G.  
 Smith, Henry  
 Snow, Mrs. Fred G.  
 Soga, Y.  
 Soper, W. H.  
 Spalding, E. I.

Spaulding, Mrs. Philip E.  
 Stanley, W. L.  
 Staley, Dr. Mildred  
 Stokes, John F. G.  
 Thayer, W. W.  
 Thayer, Mrs. Rhoda Green  
 Thomas, H. N.  
 Titcomb, Miss Margaret  
 Tracy, Clifton H.  
 Vetlesen, L. M.  
 Waldron, J. W.  
 Walker, Miss Margaret J.  
 Wall, Walter E.  
 Warinner, Miss Emily  
 Warinner, John M.  
 Waterhouse, George S.  
 Waterhouse, John  
 Watson, Mrs. E. B.  
 Webb, Mrs. Lahilahi  
 Wilcox, Mrs. May T.  
 Wilder, Gerrit P.  
 Wilder, James A.  
 Williams, H. H.  
 Wilson, William F.  
 Winne, Jane L.  
 Winne, Mary P.  
 Wodehouse, E. H.  
 Young, J. M.  
 Yzendoorn, Rev. Fr. Reginald

# KAUAI BRANCH KAUAI HISTORICAL SOCIETY

---

## OFFICERS

|                          |                      |
|--------------------------|----------------------|
| President.....           | ERIC A. KNUDSEN      |
| Vice-President.....      | LYLE A. DICKEY       |
| Secretary-Treasurer..... | MISS ELSIE H. WILCOX |

---

## MEMBERS

|                            |                             |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Alexander, William P.      | Jordan, Miss Charlotte A.   |
| Alexander, Mrs. William P. | Knudsen, Eric A.            |
| Broadbent, E. H. W.        | Kuhns, Dr. J. M.            |
| Broadbent, Mrs. E. H. W.   | Kuhns, Mrs. J. M.           |
| Corstorphine, James B.     | Lai, Mrs. Carlotta S.       |
| Crawford, Frank            | Lydgate, J. M.              |
| Crawford, Mrs. Frank       | Lyman, Mrs. Helen L.        |
| Dickey, Lyle A.            | Marcallino, Mrs. M. M.      |
| Dole, Charles S.           | McBryde, Alexander M.       |
| Faye, Miss Isabel          | McIntyre, Miss Katherine M. |
| Grote, Mrs. W. H.          | Menefoglio, Mrs. A.         |
| Hardy, W. V.               | Moore, Walter C.            |
| Hardy, Mrs. W. V.          | Moragne, J. H.              |
| Hedley, Dr. John           | Plews, J. C.                |
| Hedley, Mrs. John          | Plews, Mrs. J. C.           |
| Henderson, B. B.           | Pratt, J. S. B.             |
| Hills, A. D.               | Pratt, Mrs. J. S. B.        |
| Hjorth, John L.            | Raymond, George S.          |
| Hobby, W. R.               | Rice, Charles A.            |
| Hobby, Mrs. W. R.          | Rice, Mrs. Charles A.       |
| Hofgaard, Mrs. C. B.       | Rice, Philip L.             |
| Hofgaard, D.               | Rice, Mrs. Philip L.        |
| Hogg, Mrs. I. J.           | Rice, William Henry         |
| Isenberg, Mrs. Dora R.     | Rice, Mrs. William Henry    |
| Johnson, Miss Jennie       | Roe, Miss H. Estelle        |

Sloggett, H. D.  
Smith, Miss Agnes D.  
Stewart, W. N.  
Stewart, Mrs. W. N.  
Swan, E. S.  
Swan, Mrs. E. S.  
Troeller, Mrs. Edith S.  
Waterhouse, Dr. A. H.  
Waterhouse, Mrs. A. H.

Wedemeyer, Henry C.  
Wedemeyer, Mrs. Henry C.  
Wichman, Mrs. Juliet Rice  
Wilcox, Mrs. Anna C.  
Wilcox, Miss Elsie H.  
Wilcox, Miss Mabel I.  
Wilcox, Mrs. S. W.  
Willey, Rev. Henry A.  
Willey, Mrs. Henry A.

SPECIAL COLLECTIONS

# 7 DAY LOAN

SPECIAL PERMISSION  
DATE DUE: LAST DATE STAMPED

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

OVERDUES: NO GRACE PERIOD  
RETURN DIRECTLY TO HAWAIIAN & PACIFIC COLLECTIONS

1/67 du







10 001469920

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

HANN  
DU620

H4

1933

Class  
shelves  
C.3

PERIODICAL



TO THE MEMBERS OF THE  
HAWAIIAN HISTORICAL SOCIETY  
AND TO THE PUBLIC.

Of the Society's publications, some numbers are nearly exhausted. It might be well to look over your sets and fill the gaps while copies are yet available.

The Society publishes four series, containing much valuable source material:

*Annual Reports*, beginning with 1892; including minutes of the meetings, and officers' reports, together with authoritative articles on the history of Hawaii, early and late, its government, religion, traditions, folklore, contacts with voyagers and traders and related subjects.

*Papers*, nineteen numbers, beginning with 1892; containing articles similar to those in the *Annual Reports*.

*Reprints*, five numbers, beginning with 1916; being reprints or the publication of journals written by early voyagers and relating to Hawaii.

*Genealogical Series*, three numbers, beginning with 1915; containing genealogies of local families.

The prices range from 25 cents to \$1 each number, except for a few which are rare or out of print.

MISS CAROLINE P. GREEN,  
Librarian, Hawaiian Historical Society,  
Library of Hawaii, Honolulu.